

The Classical Review

JUNE 1908

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

TRANSLATION.

THERE are two kinds of translation: one is an art, an end in itself; the other is a test, or a method of explanation, a means to another end. These are very commonly confused.

Of the first kind are the translations of a great literary work into a foreign language: Homer, Virgil, or Dante in English, Shakespeare in German, Russian, or Chinese. It is obvious that these must stand or fall by the appreciation of those who do not know the originals. If the Chinese version of Shakespeare offend against Chinese canons of good taste, or if it be unintelligible to the educated Chinese, it is a failure. So with Homer and Virgil and Dante in English. Success in this, the art of translation, can at best only be partial, because no word in any language covers exactly the same ground as a word in another language, and the associations of words are so different. With simple thoughts there is often very little difficulty; but the chief difficulty lies in association, and especially in literary association. Take for example two words, both which might be used in English books by an English speaker, *merci* and *gramecy*. If we were told no more of a book than that some English speakers used either of these, we might fairly infer the one to be a certain type

of society novel, the other antique or mock-antique, Sir Thomas Malory or William Morris. Take again the word *cynosure*: what did that mean to Thucydides? and what would it mean to us but for one passage of Milton? I need not labour the point: every scholar knows the importance of association.

But how did he learn it? Look at the English style of young men fresh from the university: have they learnt the importance of association? Have schoolboys learnt it? What journalists or members of parliament have learnt it? All these, as classes, are ignorant of much, and what knowledge they have they always overdo. If one hits on a neat phrase, the others all copy it, until it has a new set of associations, and becomes for the man of letters detestable: still they go on, for years. One of these phrases is, 'to do yeoman service,' which came into existence for the people just as the yeoman went out, killed by Cobden, and it is used by thousands of persons who have never seen a yeoman. If any of us have learnt the associations of words, we have learnt by reading our national literature, and by talking with persons who know. All this takes time, and it is not to be had in any other way. We cannot learn it from Roget's

Thesaurus, or else all the Bengalee baboos would have it. The great man of letters learns it quicker than we do, but he learns it in the same way: Shakespeare we know was a great reader, and he was also a great talker, and lived amidst a people who talked well, had moreover the advantage of seeing scores of excellent plays performed. Our method of learning, if we are to learn, must be similar, although it will not be so quick.

But if the mind is to be alive to all the delicacies of association, it must not be preoccupied. No one, I venture to say, can learn to appreciate these whilst he is learning something else: he cannot, for instance, learn the associations of English words while he is grappling with the grammar and vocabulary of a strange language; nor can he learn the associations of Latin words while he is still ignorant of the elementary words and constructions of Latin. One thing at a time: English at one time, Latin at one time, not both together. And if any one wants to understand the literary associations of Latin words and phrases, he must do it by reading Latin, not by doing something else.

It follows that we must separate the reading of English authors and the writing of English from the reading of Latin authors and the writing of Latin, if we are to learn to understand both literatures and to compose in both languages. When we have learnt how to understand and to compose in English, and how to understand and to compose in Latin, we shall be then ready to transfer a literary piece from one to the other. The more subdivision there is, the more effective is the teaching in each stage. So if we wish to enlarge the knowledge of words, we must have texts that contain only familiar syntax; and if we wish to enlarge the knowledge of syntax, we must have texts that contain only familiar words. When both words and syntax are familiar, we may use both freely together.

But there is another thing called by the same name of translation, which is not an art nor an end in itself, but a test, or a method of explanation; that is a means to an end. In the early stages of learn-

ing a foreign language, very often the shortest way to test knowledge of a new word or construction is to ask the learner to express in English what he takes it to mean. Sometimes also it is the best way to teach the meaning of a new word. This is often the most convenient way, but it is not the only way. We had once to learn, for example, the meaning of words and constructions in our own language; we learnt them by hearing others use them in many connexions, and by observing their byplay of look or gesture. If this were not enough, if the speaker could not point to a thing that he named, or act a verb, or suggest association by a tone, he could describe it, or show a picture: and if none of these things were enough, the act or thing must have remained unexplained, to be learnt by experience if at all. In learning a foreign language, we have the advantage of a superior knowledge of our own, and here a word of translation may often save the description or the action. But observe, the help we thus gain is only gained if we already understand the English word and its associations. Suppose both English and foreign word to be equally unknown, or the English known but imperfectly, translation here is no help. It will be necessary to explain the English before the foreign word can be understood; and however useful this may be for English, it is so much time wasted for the foreign language. There is the further disadvantage that the continuity of thought is broken, whilst we pass from one language to the other and back again.

Now the schoolboy is imperfect both in English and in foreign languages: it is obvious economy that he should learn and practise each of these subjects apart. His power of transferring thoughts from one language to another is limited by his knowledge of either language apart. He is not fit to transfer from one language to another anything that he has not learnt already to understand in both: that is, the standard of his translation must be within the stage of his knowledge of the idioms of both languages. In other words, he cannot learn the idiom of either language by translation, he can only

practise what he has in some other way learnt.

But in what way?

The idiom of a language is the usage of its best authors; and this can only be learnt by reading those authors, or hearing them read, in the original. I hope enough has been said to show that familiarity with (say) Latin idiom cannot be gained by translating it into English, only by reading or hearing it in Latin. The same may be said of vocabulary: the Latin word and its associations are learnt by reading as many as possible of the passages where it occurs, not by looking at it with the eye and saying or thinking of an English word. It follows that more Latin may be learnt from reading a book of Livy than from translating it; and more Latin from reading six books of Livy once, than from reading one book of Livy six times. After the learner has read these six books, making occasional compositions out of his own head on similar themes, he is then ready to translate a piece of Livy into English, provided that he has already shown himself capable of writing English on political and military themes. He is also ready to translate a piece of Napier or Gibbon into Latin, but this will come later than the power to translate Livy into English in proportion as he knows English better than he knows Latin. I do not mean to imply that he translates nothing until he has read six books, for he must practise occasionally, but that after having read six books, he will be ready to do the translation either way, to a certain degree, without violating the idiom of either language.

The question now recurs, what part is to be played by translation in the course of teaching? *Ex hypothesi*, the pupil will be reading his six books of Livy in Latin; and the only way to make sure of this, is actually to hear the whole six books read aloud in class. How are we to make sure that he has prepared his work, or that he understands what he reads? We will assume, for the present, that he was supposed to prepare at least part of the lesson with his dictionary at hand, and that we desire to test whether he has done so. The answer is, that the reading itself is

generally a sufficient test. Neither Latin nor any other language can be properly read aloud, with due emphasis and proper phrasing, unless it is understood; and the master will at once stop his reader if he does not read aright, and will ask him what he means or will correct the reading himself. Moreover, the master knows, or ought to know, what words and phrases are new, or likely to be misunderstood; and these he will ask about or explain, whether the reader read properly or not. If we are right in desiring to concentrate attention on one thing at a time, and in avoiding breaks of continuity, as I have argued above, these questions and these explanations will all be in Latin. Every now and then will come something which the master cannot make sure of, and here he will ask for or give an English rendering of a word or a difficult sentence, or better still, an English paraphrase in explanation; but the fewer these breaks the better for the purpose of learning Latin, and in any case the English given in explanation must be already familiar. By this means every moment of the lesson is given to learning or practising Latin, and the pace and thoroughness of the work is enormously increased. Reasonable care and preparation on the master's part will enable him to bring in day by day one or other of the difficult constructions and idioms of the language, until all become quite familiar. By the same means the common accident becomes quite familiar, with a minimum of the learning of paradigms by heart.

What I have just described is suitable for a sixth form; and it is, indeed, remarkable how easy it is to dispense with English altogether in the reading lesson. I do not speak of technical grammar, notes, and questions, which are best given in English; but they may be kept by themselves; I speak of the reading, that which is commonly treated as a basis for English construing. With the lower forms, a more rigid test is needed. Here my own experience recommends that new work be treated in form as above, paraphrased and explained by means of Latin or Greek words already familiar, as a preparation, and that the home work

consist partly in writing out the translation of the piece so prepared. Here the ground covered will be less, the explanations longer and oftener; but still no time is lost, everything, or almost everything, being in Latin or Greek. With care, each preparation lesson may be made a lesson both in accident and syntax, the explanations being partly dictated, or taken down summarily, for use at home. In the earliest stages, again, the bed-rock vocabulary of simple words, and a good deal of accident as well, may be taught along with action. But in the early stages, more English explanations will be necessary of new words, until the pupils have material to go on with. Yet it is possible to do a great deal even then without English, if the master makes up his mind to do without it as far as possible. This subject, however, is too large to deal with here; and I must refer to Mr. W. H. S. Jones's *First Latin Book* (Macmillan), where a system is worked out for the earlier lessons.

The master must not be afraid of talking over the heads of his boys; that is the way we learn our own tongue, and, if used judiciously, it is most effective. There is no need, for example, to wait for the third declension before one can cry *O di immortales!* and there is no need to explain what it means when said, if said with appropriate look and tone. Many idioms not in the schedule may be made familiar long before the end of the first term, and when they are met with in books, a word or two will throw light on the accumulated associations, and fix them for ever. For example, the dependent question, *nescio quid dicas*, may be used by the master long before it is used by the pupils; and as soon as their curiosity is excited to ask the reason of the mood, all may be explained when the boys' minds are ready to receive it, eager to learn, and not passively resisting. So with the wish, *utinam tu eloquaris*, or *o si sapiens esses*—but enough. Thought, care, and system are wanted, but with these much can be done.

One point I must lay stress on, because it might not seem obvious: the less test-construing there is, the better is the English

style of the translations that are done. The average translation in schools is bad, there is no doubt of that: it is full of mistakes in idiom, dog-English in fact; it is mechanical, a machine-made product; worst of all, it abounds in nonsense. It is worse than the average Latin composition, because the makers of it ought to know that it is nonsense, and do see that as soon as the fact is pointed out. Read out A's rendering of a passage, and all the letters of the alphabet, including A himself, will be highly amused; yet others may be just as bad. Now there is absolutely no excuse for nonsense in English. For mistaking the sense of a word there may be excuse, but there is none for nonsense. But in the renderings of all stages, from top to bottom, when the work has been done in the way suggested above, there is practically no nonsense. I have before me all the written work of four forms for a term; and there is in it practically no nonsense, and very little unidiomatic English. Meanings are mistaken not infrequently, but the word given is then generally one that might have stood in its place without offence. There is no mechanical likeness at all: each version is the author's, often racy and characteristic, always his own. There is one exception: he is a boy who has elsewhere been learning Greek for three years on the usual plan, and he is placed with a form that has been learning Greek for four terms on the plan described. His papers are nearly all nonsense; yet he is not inferior to the others in ability. This is not a unique experience; we have found this strong aptitude for nonsense in nearly every case where boys have joined us after learning French, Latin, or Greek elsewhere. Let me take a short passage (Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* 10) as an example.

ἀκούσατε ὡς ἔχει ἡμῖν τὰ πράγματα. μικρὸν μὲν ἡμῖν, ὡς ὁρᾶτε, τὸ σκαφίδιον καὶ ὑπόσαθρον ἴσθι καὶ διαρρεῖ τὰ πολλὰ, καὶ ἦν τραπῇ ἐνθάδε, οἰχθήσεται περιτραπέν, ὑμεῖς δ' ἅμα τοσούτοις ἤκετε πολλὰ ἐπιφερόμενοι ἕκαστος.

The spaced words and phrases were new and had to be explained; the rest was also explained by paraphrase, even when not necessary, to make sure. The only English used was to explain the intransitive use of

the verb in *ὡς ἔχει*, and the rest was as follows:

σκαφίδιον· σκάφος μικρόν, πλοῖον μικρόν, οὐ μέγα.
 ὑπόσαθρον· ὀλίγον σαθρόν· ὑπόσαθρόν ἐστιν σκάφος
 ὅταν εἰσέλθῃ τὸ ὕδωρ· τοῦναντίον δ' ὕγιές.
 διαρρεῖ· τοῦτ' ἐστίν, εἰσρεῖ τὸ ὕδωρ· ὅταν εἰσρέῃ τὸ
 ὕδωρ, διαρρεῖ τὸ σκάφος τὰ πάντα, παντελῶς.
 αἰχρήσεται· φροῦδον γενήσεται, διολεῖται.
 ἐπὶ θάτερα, ἢ τὰ ἕτερα· ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν ἕτερον τοῦχον ἢ
 ἐπὶ τὸν ἕτερον.

The explanations were driven home by questions, so framed as to exact the use of the words by the pupils. It will be observed that the vocabulary is thus enlarged (the spaced words were new), the accident is practised (*μέγα, εἰσρέῃ, εἰσέλθῃ, γενήσεται, διολεῖται*), and the syntax also (*ὅταν εἰσρέῃ, ὅταν εἰσέλθῃ*): these are not new, but old work practised. Now take one or two renderings, as they come.

A. Listen what we have to do. We have only a very little boat, as you see, and a somewhat rotten one, also it leaks very much, and if it should turn either way it would turn and go down; but you who came all brought many things.

B. But listen what the trouble is. As you know, our boat is small and rather rotten, and leaks a great deal, and it will upset before it gets over, especially as you all have so much baggage.

C. Hear how things are going on with us. Our boat is small as you see, it is a bit rotten and leaking badly, and if it goes to the other side it will turn turtle, and here have all you people come together with a lot of luggage.

Z. Listen to what he has done to us. As you see he is small, with little sense and half rotten, and escapes the rest and had turned to the others and he will be going all round. Then you come each bringing many things.

It should be remembered that the passage was not translated into English; the above represents the independent work of each boy. Mistakes are made in *ὡς ἔχει, ἐπὶ θάτερα*, and *περιτραπέν*; and as these are repeated by several more, it is clear that they were not properly explained. To remedy this would be quite easy another time, and these particular mistakes may be expected to disappear. A is not very good in style, but B and C are, and none of them writes nonsense. All are typical examples, taken at random from the exercises. But the unhappy Z gives a complete hash of nonsense for all except the last few words; he is the boy referred to above, who has been learning Greek for

three years by means of paradigms and construing.¹

I will take now one or two examples to suggest the possibilities of the method. First, I copy a boy's notes from his notebook exactly, mistakes and all: the text is Theocr. xv. 1-4 and 27-32 atticized (No. 2 in my little *Greek Reader*).

Γοργῶ Γοργοῦς V. and D. Γοργοί.

ἀπληστε· ἐστὶ ὅς μὴδέποτε πληρεῖς γίγνεται.

ἐγχεῶ=pour in.

δύστηνος κακοδαῖμων, οὐκ εὐδαῖμων.

νίπτω νίψω ἐνίψα· λούειν πόδας εἰ χεῖρας.

εἰλίσσω ἐλίσσω εἰλίστα εἰλίσμαι.

θάττον· ταχέως, θάττον, τάχιστα (μᾶλλον ταχέως).

ἵνα λούωμαι, φέρε ὕδωρ.

οὕτως λούονται οἱ Ἕλληνες. πρῶτον μὲν λεκάνην

τιθέασιν ἐπὶ τραπέζης κένην. μετὰ ταῦτα ἢ

δοῦλη φέρει τὸ ὕδωρ ἐν προχώῃ. ὁ μὲν ἐκτείνει

τὰς χεῖρας, ἢ δε δοῦλη πρόχει το ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τας

χεῖρας, ὁ δε τριβεῖ τας χεῖρας τῷ σμήματι.

ἔχει with the adverb expresses a state. ἔχει κάλιστα, that's very nice.

The mistakes *πληρεῖς, εἰ* for *πλήρης, ἢ* were due to lack of care on the master's part, and can therefore be avoided by his taking more care to speak clearly. *ἐγχεῶ* was explained in English, and *προχώῃ* by means of a picture. A few definitions or explanations from the master's notes on other lessons may now be cited.

πρίων· ὄργανον σιδηροῦν, ἔχον ὀδόντας.

μετανοεῖν· ἀλλάττειν τὴν γνώμην, ἢ ἐθέλειν μὴ ἐμβεβηκέναι.

νεῖν· νέουσιν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, προφέροντες μὲν τὰς χεῖρας, λακτίζοντες δὲ τοῖς σκέλεσιν.

διαγίγνωσκε· διάταπτε τοὺς μὲν ἐνθάδε, τοὺς δ' ἐκεῖ.

οὐκ ἐκόμισα εὖ ποιῶν· εὖ ἐποίησα οὐ κομίσας.

κόραξ· μέλας ὄρνις ὃς κρώζει καὶ καὶ.

κύων· ὁ κύων βαῦζει αὐτὸν αὐτόν.

I make no apology for offering these details: in no other way can an unfamiliar process be explained. It would be easy to show by further examples how any words or constructions that the master wishes to use

¹ The following details may be of interest. Form V: 4th year of Latin, 2nd year of Greek. Average age 15.9. Average mark on term's translations (done without construe, in the manner described): Latin, Tacitus' *Agricola*; upper division 71%, lower division 55.5%. Greek, Lucian, *Select Dialogues* and passages from *Reader*, 58%. Best mark: Latin 90.5%, Greek 88%. Worst mark: Latin 42.5%, Greek 57.2%. A full report has been sent to the Board of Education. (Z is not included in this reckoning.)

may be brought into a lesson. My opinion has of course not been based on the above examples only, but upon prolonged experiment with sixth form work, and upon a carefully planned experiment with two lower forms. It has been fortified, and indeed the experiment was partly suggested, by the brilliant success of the same principles as applied to French and German; and I wish to express my hearty admiration for the ability and insight shown in the methods of modern language teachers. There is no department of classical teaching which we may not improve by sitting at their feet.

The line of reasoning sketched above, and the experiments based on it, have led me to the conclusion that there is an enormous waste of time and energy in our classical work. Some claim that classics are useful because they teach English; I think I have shown that if English be taught, classics cannot be taught at the same time, and that

the proper economy is to take English by itself and Latin and Greek each by itself. I am also convinced that the use of construing in the classical lesson is a danger to English, because it encourages the misuse of words and idiom, and implants and fosters the habit of writing nonsense. Further, that a true understanding of Latin and Greek can only be got by reading widely in those languages; and that translation as an art can only be taught after both English and Latin or Greek have been made familiar. The material of our work will be got by reading aloud, and its use taught by constant question and answer, summarizing, and imitation, in the same language, English or other; whilst translation first into English and later from English will form the last stages, to be practised occasionally, and only after other means have been taken to forestall and prevent probable mistakes.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

THE PAEANS OF PINDAR AND OTHER NEW LITERATURE.

(*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part V.)¹

IN the latest gift from Oxyrhynchus, lovers of great literature, and especially of poetry, have no contemptible portion. The recovered MS. of Pindar, comprising poems to be classed more or less certainly as paeans, has indeed sustained such damage that, in what the editors have made legible, much must be regarded as material for the student rather than as food for the reader. But there remain several passages which display the author (whose identity is established beyond question) in an aspect both characteristic and novel.

The impression we receive is that in this class of poem, composed for public ceremonies and upon public commission, Pindar must have been at least as successful as in the *Epinicia*, where (it is possible to think) the magnificence and the enthusiasm are

sometimes imperfectly supported by the importance of the occasion, as it would be estimated by the average standards of human sentiment. No such objection, at all events, can be laid against a hymn composed for the citizens of Abdera, to celebrate their gratitude for the successful labour of past generations, which had carved out a home of Hellenic life in the rich but inhospitable barbarism of Thrace, their loyalty to the federal bond, which, under the mighty direction of Athens, had given new security and opened new prospects to their enterprise, and their common resolve to be worthy of such a tradition and such opportunities.

The remains of this Ode, the second in order among the seven of which comprehensible portions have been recovered, exhibit at least one passage, which is a notable addition to our store of Greek poetry, and not less interesting as a document of Greek religion. A careful examination of this will perhaps be more profitable

¹ Edited, with translations and notes, by Bernard P. Grenfell, D.Litt., etc., and Arthur S. Hunt, D.Litt., etc. London: Egyptian Exploration Fund, 1908.

to students of literature than a description of the papyrus at large. It happens also that the finders and editors, whose work in both capacities we cordially appreciate, have here, unless we mistake, left an opening larger than usual, not merely for correction or supplement of details, but for general exposition of the theme and the purpose.

'Whatsoever is planted in prudence and respect (αἰδώς) grows ever happily in a gentle calm.

'And this gift may Heaven give us.

'Yet, for those that are long since dead, envy and the malice thereof are past and gone; and to his fathers a man should in duty bring an ample share of praise.

'They, having won by war a country of wealthy dower, planted prosperity firm, beyond the wild Paeonians and the land of Strymon, strong breeder of warriors.

'Yet upon their haste descended a sudden fate (?), which when they had borne, the gods thereafter aided accomplishment.

'Bright in the blaze of eulogy stands he by whom a glorious thing is achieved; but upon *those*, our fathers, fell—the light supreme, in front of Melamphyllon, facing the foe;

'(Ho, Paeon, ho, for the Healer, and may he never cease from us!)

'Yet, when they came to the River, and close thereby, that host, so few in arms, were to meet with a numerous host. It was the first of the month when this befell; and these were messengers from kind Hecate, Maid of the red foot, showing the tale of the folk, who were fain to come to birth.¹

- 50 τὸ δ' εὖβου-
λίη τε καὶ αἰδοῖ
ἐγκείμενον αἰεὶ θάλλει μαλακαῖς εὐδαια.
καὶ τὸ μὲν διδόντω
θεός· ὁ δ' ἐχθρὰ νοήσας
55 ἦδη φθόνος οἰχεται
τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων,
χρὴ δ' ἄνδρα τοκεῦσιν φέρειν
βαθύδοξον αἶσαν.
ἐπ. τοὶ σὺν πολέμῳ κτησάμενοι
60 χθόνα πολυδώρον, δλβον
ἐγκατέθηκαν πέραν ἀ[γρίων] Παιόνων]
αἰχματῶν [τε Στρυμονίας γὰρ]

¹ *Oxyrh. Pap.* v. p. 29; Poem II. (*For the citizens of Abdera*), vv. 50 ff.

ζαθέας τροφοῦ· ἀλλὰ [θοὰ θοοῖς]

ἐπέπεσε μοῖρα· τλάντων δ'

65 ἔπειτα θεοὶ συνετέλεσαν.

ὁ δὲ καλὸν τι ποιήσας

εὐαγοραιοῖσιν φλέγει·

κείνοις δ' ὑπέρτατον ἦλθε φέγγος

ἄντα δυσμενέων Μελαμ-

70 φύλλου προπάρουθεν—

ἰήϊε παιάν, ἰήϊε· παιάν

δὲ μήποτε λείποι—

στρ. ἀλλὰ μιν ποταμῷ σχεδὸν μολόντα φύρσει
βαιοῖς σὺν ἔντεσιν

75 ποτὶ πολλὸν στρατὸν· ἐν² δὲ μηνός

πρῶτον τύχην ἄμαρ·

ἀγγελλε δὲ φοινικίῳ λόγον παρθένος

εὐμενῆς Ἑκάτα

τὸν ἐθέλοντα γενέσθαι.

The text here, as generally wherever the MS. is legible, seems to be good and indeed almost faultless. Except in the places indicated, the supplements of the editors are minute and obvious, and I have adopted their readings, all but one. In the fifth verse of the epode (63) they give ἄλλα [δ' ἀγοισά τοι], which is possible, but in the word *τοι* perhaps not very satisfactory. However, the doubt is insignificant: whatever we should read, the sense of this clause is plain. What is not so plain is the connexion of the whole, and that we are now to consider.

The singers are praising their progenitors or predecessors, the founders of the colony, whose flourishing state they themselves enjoy. The topic, as possibly invidious and provoking to the Powers, is approached with the habitual wariness of the Greek. Even prudence (they say) may, and should, be liberal in praise of those whom death has removed from jealousy.³ And in pursuance of the same precaution, as well as from a sense of justice, those especially are chosen for praise, whose contribution to the work was not a triumph, but a sacrifice, the loss of their lives in a temporary disaster, bravely sustained and eventually, but by others, redeemed. Those, who in some sense failed, deserve praise not less, and

² For ἐν, ὅν: see Editors' note.

³ *βαθύδοξον αἶσαν* (58) is equivalent to *βαθείαν αἶσαν* δόξης.—'The descendant should himself carry to [the ancestors] the praise of a nobly spent life,' Edd. Papyri, citing *Nem.* vi. 46 *ἐπεὶ σφιν κ.τ.λ.*; but this seems less simple and appropriate.

need it more, because, as the poet finely says, the successful man has the blaze of his success. Such a disaster had arrested, as we here learn, the establishment or development of Abdera. 'Before Melamphyllon'—name of sad sound yet beautiful, which Pindar uses with characteristic skill—there came upon the victims of the day no blaze indeed of triumph, but the light, both *last* and *highest*, of a patriot's death, *ἰπέρτατον φέγγος*, *summa lux*, as it is called with tender ambiguity.

So far all is clear. But in the sequel the connexion is less obvious, and the editors do not seem to have found it. The sentence—

ἀλλὰ μιν ποταμῷ σχεδὸν μολόντα φύρσει
βαιοῖς σὺν ἔντεσιν
ποτὶ πολλὸν στρατόν—

they translate thus: 'But they shall put him to confusion when he has come near the river, matched with a small army against a great host'; and upon this version, which plainly cannot be a continuation of the preceding story, they remark: 'The future indicative in *φύρσει* seems unintelligible, except on the view that these three lines give the substance of an ancient oracle.' The fulfilment of this oracle, we are to understand, is indicated in the next words, *ἐν δὲ μηνὸς πρῶτον τύχην ἄμαρ*, translated by, 'It fell out on the first day of the month.'¹

But is this explanation acceptable? Is it possible that the passage, if so meant, could ever have been understood? It is not suggested that the supposed quotation verbally follows the alleged oracle, which, as the editors say upon the suggestion of Prof. Blass, would naturally run in hexameters. Nothing in the context, or in the sentence itself, indicates that the story is dropped, and that we are suddenly carried to a new subject and a new speaker. The

¹ Rather, 'It was the first of the month (when this befell).' The difference, though small, is not quite immaterial. See hereafter.—The schol. to *v.* 77, *προέλεγεν τ[ὴν] μέλλ[ουσαν μάχην] τοῖς ἡμετέροις*, as given by the editors, points to a prophecy of the battle; but the essential words are a supplement, and rightly marked as doubtful. In any case the note could not be conclusive; the scholia are often plainly wrong.

former subject, that of the fight at Melamphyllon, is by no means plainly finished; on the contrary we expect, after the parenthetic appeal to 'the Healer', that the theme will be resumed and carried on to a happy or consolatory termination. In these circumstances, how could the quotation be apprehended as such? Nor is it explained how the interpretation leads to the sequel and to the mention of Hecate and her 'message'. Was this message the oracle? It seems hard to suppose so, or to make out, on these lines, any continuity of thought. We demur, therefore, to the hypothesis of a quotation as neither warranted nor useful.

All must be the words of Pindar and part of the story, and must relate to the same subject as the preceding, the fight at Melamphyllon, and, in particular, those who fell there. Nor does the future (*φύρσει*) make any difficulty. The future is of that kind which may be called 'historical', and is equally admissible in English, when a narrator desires that the hearer should approach a certain event with something of the feeling which it aroused in the actors at the time, and should view the event as a surprise. 'When the host comes to the river, certain things *will* occur' means (in a story) that they did occur, but that we are to approach them in imagination along with the host.² Nor need we make any mystery about the unexpressed subject of the verb *φύρσει*. It is *ποταμός*, supplied from *ποταμῷ*. No other can be supplied, and this presents itself naturally.³ An ordinary writer, a prose-writer or a poet less bold than Pindar, would no doubt have made the 'host' the subject of the sentence, writing it somewhat thus:—*ἀλλὰ παρὰ ποταμῷ σχεδὸν μολὼν μίξεται στρατὸς βαιὸς πολλῷ*

² In English, under such circumstances, we generally use the 'past future', and say that the things 'were to' happen; Greek, which habitually narrates in the present tense (historical), naturally uses (as we also can do) the simple future.

³ It is conceivable that Pindar wrote *ποταμός* (not *ποταμῷ*) leaving the *dative* to be supplied, a more common arrangement, but this supposition is not at all necessary. The arrangement actually given is both correct and clear.

στρατῷ (or πρὸς πολλὸν στρατόν), 'near by the river, the small host, when it arrives, will meet with a great one.' This common form Pindar characteristically varies and embroiders. First he personifies the river, ποταμὸς μίξει στρατὸν πρὸς στρατόν, 'the river will bring one host to the other'—thereby lifting the style, and at the same time indicating that the juncture or meeting will occur 'close to' the river indeed, but after the coming host shall have passed it. Next, for the familiar μίγνυσθαι (μίγνιναι), so freely used for *meet, encounter*, even in prose, that it had lost colour and force as a figure, he substitutes the synonymous, but not familiar, φύρεν: the river will *interfuse* (instead of 'join') one host with the other. Such freshening and strengthening of a metaphor is among the chief and most frequent marks of his manner. Lastly, to avoid the commonplace antithesis στρατὸν βαῖν πρὸς πολλὸν στρατόν, he develops στρατὸν βαῖον into στρατὸν μολόντα βαιοῖς σὺν ἔντεσι, and for στρατόν puts an anticipatory pronoun, μιν, which is afterwards interpreted by relation to the antithetic πρὸς πολλὸν στρατόν. This last point, the use of the pronoun, is the only point in which the structure of the sentence presents obscurity; and even this is smoothed in Greek by a peculiarity of the language, which in English cannot be reproduced,—the ambiguous number of μιν, representing both singular and plural. As placed here, it must naturally be taken first as plural (*them*), referring to the plural (κείνους v. 68) of the preceding sentence. Thus, when heard, it explains itself, and in the sense intended. The effect could be represented in prose by ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς, βαῖον στρατὸν μολόντα, μίξει ὁ ποταμὸς πρὸς πολλὸν στρατόν. But the fact that the actual pronoun, μιν, can also in form be singular, makes easy to the ear the transition to μολόντα, the case of which is determined by στρατὸν, afterwards supplied. English, being incapable of this phonetic accommodation, cannot with convenience reproduce the sentence verbally. The sense we may represent thus: 'But close by the river, when they arrive, this host so few in arms will, at the passing, meet a numerous host.'

They means, as shown by the context, the dead of Melamphyllon; the description of them as 'few in arms' suggests that in that disaster the small force of the nascent Abdera was wholly or nearly destroyed. *Them* therefore, the dead, we follow, as directed by the future tense, to see what further befell them after their death.

Where then, we are next to ask, did this 'meeting' take place, and whom did the warriors meet? The story answers both questions. It was 'by the River',—by the River, which in such a connexion needs neither name nor description, and indeed has no universally accepted name, though it is known without name in the religious poetry of all times and peoples, not least in our own:

Part of the host have crossed the flood,
And part are crossing now.

It is the River of Death,¹ the boundary between the seen world and the unseen, and the passage into that other. By this water the fallen warriors were carried to their meeting, on the further shore, with a multitude far exceeding their little number. And this multitude were, not, as we might for a moment suppose, their ancestors and predecessors, but, as we are immediately told, their successors and descendants, those who 'were fain to be born'. The conception assumes and depends upon the doctrine which is used, with the same consolatory purpose, in the *Sixth Aeneid*. In the other world, the world of the dead, dwell and may be seen not only the souls that have lived, but also those which are to be born and live hereafter. Indeed the distinction of the two classes is rather one of stage and condition than of personal identity, if as Virgil declares and Pindar may here imply,² the same soul passes through successive births. At all events, there they are and

¹ Anonymous, as here, and with great advantage to the effect, in Homer, *Il.* 23. 74: the ghost of Patroclus says τῇλέ με ἐργουσι ψυχὰ ἐδῶλα καμώντων | οὐδέ μέ ποω μισγεσθαι ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο ἰῶσιν—a passage which, by μισγεσθαι, may have suggested Pindar's φύρει.

² There is perhaps a suggestion of this in the phrase τὸν ἐθέλοντα γενέσθαι, which may refer to the preparation by which, according to Virgil, the soul is led to desire the renewal of life.

may be seen, the souls that are destined and desire to be born. And as Anchises saw and showed to Aeneas with delight the many and mighty forms of the future Romans, so did the warriors, who had given their lives for Abdera, see with joy and consolation the 'many' that were to be,—the host of future Abderites, among them doubtless the singers of Pindar's paean, for whose happy lives their sacrifice had prepared the way.

Nor had they to wait for this consolation until, like Aeneas, they had reached some secret Elysium, some inner place in the spectral territory, where the future souls habitually dwelt. 'Close by the River' it was, and 'at their arrival,' that the great host met them,—a special favour this from Hecate, Queen of that Realm. For it happened that the new-comers had a special claim to the favour of Hecate, the *diva triformis*, Lady of Birth and of Death and Lady of the Moon, *Proserpina*, *Luna*, *Diana*. The day of Melamphyllon chanced to be 'the first of the month', the day sacred to Hecate in her lunar aspect. Therefore the Queen, in honour of the day, graciously sent¹ the future souls to meet them, as her messengers, and to show 'the number that were fain to be born', the great and prosperous population by which their own small number was to be happily replaced.

Here again, in the words ἀγγελλε λόγον τὸν ἐθέλοντα γενέσθαι, we have a characteristic specimen of Pindar's pregnant phrase. In λόγος there is the same ambiguity as in the English *tale*. It means both *number* and *story*, as λέγω is either *count* or *relate*. Here, by reference to πολλὸν *many*, *numerous*, it means primarily *number*, and is a poetical synonym for ἀριθμός. But the connexion with ἀγγελλε also imports the more common meaning, *story*. The future souls were not only to show their number, but also to tell their destinies, as the destinies of Rome and of the Roman souls are told by Anchises to Aeneas. And to suit the latter sense, λόγον τὸν ἐθέλοντα γενέσθαι is written boldly for

λόγον (ἀριθμόν) τὸν τῶν ἐθέλοντων γενέσθαι, 'the number of those that would be born'. The word ἐθέλοντα, *fain*, *wishing*, applies literally to the multitude, the souls, who were eager for the life they were to enjoy, but to the 'story' applies in figure only, as a poetical equivalent for μέλλοντα.

The allusion to the date of Melamphyllon, 'the first of the month,' might suggest that the ode was intended for performance on the anniversary of the battle. But the inference would be doubtful. More probably that day was black in the calendar of Abdera, and celebrated, if at all, by offices of mourning. But in a paean, this and all topics are to be turned to the purpose of joy, comfort, and gratitude, as Pindar very happily does. The fallen heroes, *because of the day*, received instant assurance of the prospect since, realized, by which their heroism was repaid. And to signify this transition, the cheering refrain, 'Oh Healer, oh the Healer! Never may He cease from us!' is introduced between the sorrow and the consolation.

To Hecate is given the epithet φοινικόπεδα, which the editors render by 'rosy-footed'. They remark that it

is applied to Demeter in *Ol.* vi. 94, where the epithet has been supposed . . . to refer to the red colours of harvest; but no such allusion can be claimed in the case of Hecate, and no doubt in both passages the adjective is used, like ῥοδοσπηχες, of personal charms only.

That 'harvest' is irrelevant we must agree, and indeed it is scarcely admissible in the place cited, where 'red-footed Demeter' is associated with Hecate 'her daughter of the white steeds'. But neither there nor here is it apparent why the 'personal charms' of the goddesses should be noticed, nor is φοινικο- (*red*, *crimson*) quite the same thing as ῥοδο- (*rosy*), nor is it certain that the foot itself has the colour; it may be a sandal or foot-gear of some kind, with which both the Mother and the Maid, in certain aspects, were represented or invested. As to the meaning of the symbol, nothing precise seems provable either from *Ol.* vi. 94 or from the paean; but a happy significance would suit that place, and in the paean seems to be required.

¹ Note the imperfect tense of ἀγγελλε, marking that the message is coincident with the coming of the 'great host', and is another aspect of it,—'Hecate was thereby sending a message.'

This passage, on the meeting of the spectral hosts, is, I think, the most interesting, from a poetical point of view, in the new Pindar. It is one of the longest fragments intact, and appears to include everything necessary to comprehension. Earlier in the same poem (p. 27, ii. 24), we have a piece which exhibits the poet in a vein perhaps without example in the *Epinicia*. The City of Abdera speaks for itself, and with the joyful gaiety befitting a 'youthful' town. 'My home is the land of Thrace, rich in vines and in corn. May my increasing age hereafter not fail to stand secure! Young as I am, I have been a mother to her from whom my own mother came, when the fire of the foe had smitten her.'

νεόπολις εἰμι· μητὴρ
δὲ μητὴρ' ἐμᾶς ἔτεκον ἔμπαν
πολεμῶ πυρὶ πλαγείσαν.

The allusion, explained by a marginal note and sufficiently obvious, is to the burning of Athens by the Persians: from Athens came the colonizers of Teos, and from Teos was founded Abdera. The restoration of Athens is claimed by Abdera as her work, a boast which may have had some special explanation unknown to us, but does not seem to require it. In a political sense, the elevation of the new Athens, the Athens of the hegemony and the empire, was in fact the work of the Ionian cities, and of Abdera therefore as one of them. If the grandchild exaggerates her part, that is not surprising on a festal occasion. The form of expression, *μητὴρ μητὴρ' ἔτεκον*, though quaint, is simple and passable as a jest,¹—not perhaps a particularly admirable jest, but we should hardly expect Pindar to be very dexterous in this line. It is amusing to see that at the call of the people, and inspired by the frank rejoicing of a popular holiday, he could condescend to such a caper. The same subject, the restoration of Athens, and the material rebuilding and refortification of the city, as a type of the political construction, seems to be pursued in the sequel (v. 43), where, combining the remains of the text with the indications of the marginal notes,

¹ The editors would substitute *ἐπίδω* for *ἔτεκον*, but, upon consideration of the purpose, *ἔτεκον* seems to be necessary.

we should read apparently something like this:

ἡ μὲν οὐκ ἀπάταις ἀλλὰ δὲ τείχος ἀνδρῶν
ὕψιστον ἴστανται·
... μάναμαι μὲν
ἀντίστροφα δόξαι.

'Truly not by deceit, but by valour of men, is a wall builded highest; . . . but I fight an enemy with weapons answering to his own.' If this was the substance, we can hardly be wrong in supposing a reference to the famous craft and diplomacy of Themistocles, by which the refortification of Athens was secured against Spartan interference, and to the animated controversy, on the merits of fortifications as compared with braver defences, which, as we know already from Plato,² arose out of the occurrence. The Abderites, loyal to 'the mother of our mother', defend the use of guile where guile was so plainly intended, and the barrier of a rampart against those who could best be so met. At all events, the plain allusion to Athens, which precedes, is an interesting testimony to the enthusiasm of the confederates, while the great liberation was still fresh, for the capital and protectress of the Ionian race.

Even more remarkable, as material for history in some of its most instructive aspects as well as in poetic quality, is, or must have been, the Paean written 'for the Delphians' and addressed 'to Pytho' (p. 41, *Poem vi*). It is deplorably injured, and the gaps leave obscure, in connexion or meaning, much of what is solid. But the title, and the opening passage, afford a glimpse, in some ways rather surprising, of the conditions still subsisting, so late as the decade 470-460 B.C.,³ between the sanctuary of Pytho, perhaps on the whole the most fascinating to our curiosity of all Greek foundations, and the township or people, which eventually so absorbed the ancient oracle, that *Pythian* and *Delphian* are for us, and were for later Hellas, convertible and synonymous terms. Evidently this was by no means the case when 'Delphians', or Pindar speaking for 'Delphians', could apply, 'in the name of

² *Laws*, p. 778 D.

³ Date fixed by reference to *Nemean vii.*; see below, and the editors' Introduction, p. 20.

Olympian Zeus', to be permitted to assist 'Pytho' in the choric worship of Castalia, on the ground that the rites 'lack men', whom Pytho, it would seem, is not able effectively to supply. Such is the purport of the opening address, spoken, as we should rather suppose, by the Delphian performers of the Paean in their public and representative capacity.¹ They distinguish themselves from 'Pytho' completely, and speak of 'hearing about' the circumstances of the sacred foundation, precisely as they might if they resided elsewhere. Something of this kind, some distance and delicacy of relation between town and sanctuary, might be inferred from the cautious and scrupulous way in which their respective names are used, or rather avoided, by Aeschylus in the (almost contemporary) *Choephoroi* and prologue to the *Eumenides*. But the new paean is plainer and more definite. Totally different, we may remark, is the Delphi of forty or fifty years later, as depicted by Euripides in the *Andromache* and the *Ion*. Indeed, in the circumstances of the paean, the town of those plays can hardly be conceived to exist; it had probably been much developed by half a century of consultants, dedicators, and celebrants of the Pythian Games.

Of this paean, *For the Delphians*, and of another² out of the six or seven now partially legible, the existence was already signalized by references in the *Epinicia*,—a remarkable illustration of Pindar's copiousness in personal allusion. In the *Seventh Nemean*, written for an Aeginetan, he relates the death of the Aeacid hero Neoptolemus,

¹ The practice of Pindar in the *Epinicia* would admit, quite naturally, the supposition that it is the poet who speaks, identifying himself with his poem and requesting acceptance, nor would this much affect our point. But it does not yet appear, so far as I have observed, that in Paeanes he used, or used so freely, this personal manner, less appropriate, if admissible, when his employers were not persons or families, but cities, public bodies, or their deputies appointed for an official performance. An article on this volume in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* (Otto Schroeder) cites as examples *ἑπαιτά μοι γλῶσσαν* (Paean vi. 58) and *ἐκπύδην* (lx. 34), but in both it seems that the *choreutes* may be the speaker.

² Poem iv. *For the Ceans, to Delos*. See the editors' Introduction.

killed at Delphi, and adopts the version of the story which was approved at Aegina. According to this, the quarrel, in which Neoptolemus lost his life, arose out of the exactions and insolence of the Delphians who served the temple. To obtain their alleged dues, they fell upon the sacrifice, which Neoptolemus was offering (one is reminded of Hophni and Phineas), and for resisting this outrage, he was assassinated. The Delphians, as might be supposed, had quite another story. According to them, the provocation came from Neoptolemus himself, who insolently and impiously claimed to be paid by Apollo, out of the Delphian treasures, for the slaying of his father Achilles. The scholia to the *Seventh Nemean* inform us that the explicit adoption there of the Aeacid story—that the quarrel was 'for meats' (*περὶ κρεῶν*)—has an apologetic purpose, inasmuch as Pindar had given offence by the way in which the incident was related in his paean for the Delphians. This offending narrative, that of the paean, described the quarrel, according to the scholia, as arising *μυρίαν περὶ τιμῶν*. Boeckh, upon the suggestion of a scholium which speaks of *νομιζόμεναι τιμαί* (*accustomed payments*), changed the text of the quotation to *μοίριαν περὶ τιμῶν*, where *μοίριος*, a dubious word, was supposed equivalent to *νομιζόμενος*, *customary*. We have now the original passage (p. 47, vi. 118), where the disputed phrase appears as *ὑπὲρ περὶ τιμῶν*, pointing *prima facie*, when compared with the pre-existing citation, to *μυριάων περὶ τιμῶν*. Professor Housman, in this *Review*,³ following the lead of Boeckh but greatly improving it, proposes *κυρίαυ περὶ τιμῶν*, which would undoubtedly bear the sense sought, *authorized payments*, or payments demanded according to custom.

The point is of little importance; but in view of the interest bestowed on this legend by the *Andromache* of Euripides, which principally rests upon it, we may suggest a doubt, whether *authorized payments* or *customary payments*, however expressed, is a phrase quite suitable to the paean. The mention of *νομιζόμεναι τιμαί* in the scholium does not prove that a corresponding

³ *supra*, p. 11.

epithet stood in the text; and if it was in the text, how can we account for the offence, which the paean appears to have given at Aegina? With this epithet, the phrase seems to point clearly and exclusively to the Aeginetan version,—that the quarrel turned upon the exactions of the Delphian ministers.¹ It does not apparently even admit the Delphian version, the alleged claim for blood-money brought by Neoptolemus against Apollo, a claim assuredly not 'authorized' or customary. Why then was Aegina displeased?

Is it after all quite certain that Pindar did not write, as we are told, *μυρίαν περὶ τιμάν*, or *μυριάων περὶ τιμῶν*, about an enormous payment? The phrase is vague and scarcely intelligible; but in the circumstances this may rather confirm than impeach it. Writing for Delphians, Pindar, if he would touch on this delicate matter at all, could hardly fail to allow for the view of his employers. Yet his personal and professional connexions with Aegina would dictate caution on the other side. Is it not conceivable, that in this dilemma, he deliberately tried to cover both the alleged causes of quarrel,—the Delphian exactions and the claim of Neoptolemus, and wrote *enormous payment* in the hope that each party would be content to take it as they preferred? If his hope was disappointed, and he was forced to explain himself afterwards, at Aegina, in the Aeginetan sense, that is no unlikely result of such a prevarication. Indeed the phrase *enormous payment* points at least equally, and rather, to the claim of Neoptolemus against Apollo, and his intention, as alleged by the Delphians, to satisfy his demand by plundering the temple-treasure. It would be so interpreted by the Delphians, and the Aeginetans might well apprehend that it was so intended by the poet,² whom they blamed accordingly. We may observe that a marginal note to the papyrus (vi. 118) gives both the Aeginetan story and the

Delphian as alternative explanations of the text, which implies that the text was ambiguous, and may possibly mean that the author of the note recognized this ambiguity as intentional.³

But we are travelling beyond our purpose, and must not pursue the many questions of history and legend raised by the new 'find'. We are concerned rather to exemplify the accessions to poetry as such; these, notwithstanding the ruin of the MS., are considerable, and a subject for much congratulation to the finders.

Less attractive, and indeed to the mere reader hardly commendable at all, is the other chief novelty of the volume, a large piece from a historian, apparently of the fourth century B.C., who wrote a continuation of Thucydides. The recovered portion belongs to the middle of the decade 400–390 B.C., the commencement of hostilities between Thebes and Sparta, Agesilaus in Asia, etc. The authorship is disputed. If Theopompus was the man, certainly, he was once, as the editors say, 'a worse stylist than has generally been supposed.' The sole merit of the new writer, in this respect, seems to be that he is easy and clear. Whether we should add, with the editors, that the fragment would make Theopompus 'a greater historian', depends upon the definition of such greatness. To me it seems rather that the new annalist, with his desultory summers and winters, and his persistent silence as to any reasons why the facts, which he details, should incite an intelligent interest by their bearing upon large and permanent issues, illustrates very instructively what the Thucydidean theory of history would have produced, if Thucydides had not been greater than his

³ ἦτοι τῶν κρεῶν, ἃ διαρπαζόντων συνήθως τῶν α...ων (?) ἐδυσχέρανε καὶ ἐκόλυε, διὸ καὶ ἀνήρηται· ἢ τῶν χρημάτων, ἃ διαρπαζών εἰς ἐκδικίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀνιέρθη. Prof. Housman, whose reading and punctuation I follow, adopts ἄλλων, with the editors, for the imperfect word. If it was so written, one may suspect it to be an error for some contraction of ἀμφιπόλων, e.g. ἀμφλων. As the full word occurs in the text (ἀμφιπόλοις), it could bear abbreviation. The meaning seems to be that the temple-ministers, in pursuance of a bad custom (συνήθως), tried to seize the sacrifice of Neoptolemus in satisfaction of alleged dues.

¹ That the exactions were 'authorized', that is to say, authorized by Delphi, must have been assumed by the Aeginetans themselves, and their displeasure can hardly therefore have rested on the mere epithet.

² The more easily because the slaying of Achilles is previously mentioned in the paean, *vv.* 81–86.

theory. A rival claimant for authorship is the misty figure of Cratippus, to whom the editors incline, though they find some difficulty in supposing that so authentic a writer could be so little celebrated, as Cratippus was. After conscientiously perusing the remains, I cannot feel that this objection is invincible. Nevertheless here is a fine field for the investigation of sources.

On the other hand, we would gladly read more, if more there were, of the 'Uncanonical Gospel':

λέγει (ὁ Φαρισαῖος τῷ Σωτῆρι)· Καθαρεύω ἐλυσάμην γὰρ ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ τοῦ Δανεὶδ, καὶ δι' ἑτέρας κλίμακος κατελθὼν δι' ἑτέρας ἀνῆλθον, καὶ λευκὰ ἐνδύματα ἐνεδυσάμην καὶ καθαρὰ, καὶ τότε ἦλθον καὶ προσέβλεψα τούτοις τοῖς ἀγίοις σκεύειν. ὁ Σωτὴρ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· Οὐαί, τυφλοὶ μὴ ὁρῶντες. σὺ ἐλόισω τούτοις τοῖς χεομένοις

ὑδασιν, ἐν οἷς κύνες καὶ χοῖροι βέβληνται νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, καὶ νιψάμενος τὸ ἐκτὸς δέρμα ἐσμύξω, ὅπερ καὶ αἱ πόρναι καὶ αἱ αὐλητρίδες μυρίζουσιν καὶ λούουσιν καὶ σμήχονσι καὶ καλλωπίζουσι πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ἐνδοθεν δὲ ἐκείναι πεπλήρυνται σκορπίων καὶ πάσης κακίας. ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ μου, οὓς λέγεις μὴ βεβαπτίσθαι, βεβάμμεθα ἐν ὑδασι ζωῆς αἰωνίου κ.τ.λ.

Here we are at least in contact with the warm mind of somebody, with beliefs and purposes. Nor need one be a specialist in the matter to perceive the deeply interesting comparisons which both style and substance by likeness and by unlikeness invite.

But we must make an end, and quit an interesting volume with gratitude all the greater that it includes the hope of favours to come.

A. W. VERRALL.

THEOPOMPUS IN THE GREEK LITERARY CRITICS.

(With special reference to the newly-discovered Greek historian: Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part V., pp. 110-242.)

THE chief Greek critics who mention Theopompus are Longinus, in the *De Sublimitate*; Demetrius, in the *De Elocutione*; and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in some of his literary essays.

There are two references to Theopompus in the *De Sublimitate*. In c. 31 he is commended for his employment of a homely but effective metaphor: 'In this way, too, that original phrase of Theopompus deserves praise. Owing to the correspondence between word and fact it seems to me to be highly expressive; and yet Caecilius for some unexplained reason finds fault with it. "Philip," says Theopompus, "had a genius for *stomaching* things (ἀναγοφαγήσαι πράγματα)." Now a homely expression of this kind is sometimes much more telling than elegant language, for it is understood at once since it is drawn from common life, and the fact that it is familiar makes it only the more convincing. So the words "*stomaching* things" are used most strikingly of a man

who, for the sake of attaining his own ends, patiently and with cheerfulness endures things shameful and vile.' The author then goes on to quote the bold metaphors *καταχορδεύων ἑαυτὸν* and *ἕως ἅπας κατεκρευοργήθη* found in Herodotus (vi. 75, vii. 181), and says in conclusion, 'these phrases graze the very edge of vulgarity, but they are saved from vulgarity by their expressiveness.' The other reference to Theopompus is in c. 43, where Herodotus and he are linked together again, but this time as offenders. Both of them are apt, we hear, to mar impressive passages by triviality of expression. In describing a storm and its incidents, Herodotus will use such ill-sounding or undignified phrases as *ξεσάσης τῆς θαλάσσης*, *ὁ ἄνεμος ἐκοπίασεν*, *τέλος ἀχάριστον* (Herod. vii. 188, 191, viii. 13). And similarly Theopompus in an elaborate word-picture (too long to be reproduced in detail) of the equipment of the Persian army which invaded Egypt, had spoilt the entire effect by the use of some

petty words. After quoting this passage, the critic remarks that Theopompus here

'runs off from the more elevated to the more lowly, whereas he should, on the contrary, have risen higher and higher. With his wonderful description of the whole outfit he mixes bags and condiments and sacks, and conveys the impression of a confectioner's shop! For just as if, in the case of those very adornments, between the golden vessels and the jewelled mixing-bowls and the silver-plate and the pavilions of pure gold and the goblets, a man had actually brought and set in the midst paltry bags and sacks, the proceeding would have been offensive to the eye, so do such words when introduced out of season constitute deformities and as it were blots on the diction. He might have described the scene in broad outline just as he says that hills blocked their way, and with regard to the preparations generally have spoken of "waggons and camels and the multitude of beasts of burden carrying everything that ministers to the luxury and enjoyment of the table," or have used some such expression as "piles of all manner of grain and things which conduce preeminently to good cookery and comfort of body," or if he must necessarily put it in so uncompromising a way, he might have said that "all the dainties of cooks and caterers were there."

According to Cicero and Suidas, Isocrates said of his two pupils Theopompus and Ephorus that the former needed the curb, the latter the spur. The author of the *De Sublimitate* is familiar (ii. 2) with this antithesis; and though he does not himself use it in connexion with Theopompus and Ephorus, he doubtless knew that it had been so used.

The references made to Theopompus in Demetrius, *De Elocutione*, are all of a disparaging nature. Theopompus is evidently regarded by him as a forcible-feeble or feeble-forcible (διὸ καὶ δεινούς τινάς φασιν, ὥσπερ καὶ Θεόπομπον, δεινὰ οὐ δεινῶς λέγοντας, *De Elocutione*, § 75). It is hinted that it is his sensational topics that give him an appearance of vigour: 'Theopompus, for instance, in a certain passage describes the flute-girls in the Peiraeus, the stews, and the sailors who pipe and sing and dance; and through employing all this strong language he seems to be forcible, although his style is really feeble (§ 240).' In § 247 his forced antitheses are condemned, 'We should avoid antitheses and exact parallelisms of words in the period, since in place of force they render the style laboured and

often flat. Theopompus, for example, when inveighing against the intimates of Philip, enfeebled his invective by the following antithesis: "men-slayers in nature, they were men-harlots in life." The hearer, having his attention fixed on this elaboration, or rather affectation, forgets to be angry,' or (as we are told in § 27, where the same passage is quoted) 'indignation needs no art; in such invectives the words should be simple and, in a manner, impromptu.' In § 250 Demosthenes is censured for the same fault as Theopompus, 'Excessive antithesis, already condemned in the case of Theopompus, is out of place in Demosthenes also, as in the following passage, "You were initiating, I was initiated; you taught, I attended classes; you took minor parts in the theatre, I was a spectator; you broke down, I hissed (*De Cor.* § 265)." The elaborate parallelism of clauses produces the impression of false artifice; of trifling, rather than of honest indignation.'

In Greek critics other than Longinus, Demetrius and Dionysius, the only important references to Theopompus are, I think, to be found in Hermogenes and Theon. Hermogenes (π. ιδ. ii. 6) remarks that the Greeks did not regard the writings of Theopompus, Ephorus, Hellanicus and Philistus, as furnishing models of style in the same degree as those of Thucydides, Herodotus, Hecataeus and Xenophon. Theon (προγμν. iv. 18) complains of the lengthy digressions in the *Φιλιππικαὶ ἱστορίαι* of Theopompus: δύο γὰρ πον, καὶ τρεῖς, καὶ πλείους ἱστορίας ὅλας κατὰ παρέκβασιν εἰρίσκομεν, ἐν αἷς οὐχ ὅπως Φιλίππου, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Μακεδόνας τινὲς ὀνομά ἐστιν. Earlier (i. 4) he points out how variously one and the same idea has been conveyed by Thucydides, Theopompus and Demosthenes. *Thucydides*: φθόνος γὰρ τοῖς ζῶσι πρὸς τὸ ἀντίπαλον, τὸ δὲ μὴ ἐμποδὼν ἀνανταγωνίστῳ εὐνοίᾳ τετμήται. *Theopompus*: ἐπίσταμαι γὰρ ὅτι τοὺς μὲν ζῶντας πολλοὶ μετὰ δυσμενείας ἐξετάζονσι, τοῖς δὲ τετελευτηκόσι διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐτῶν ἐπανιάτι τοὺς φθόνους. *Demosthenes*: τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδε τῶν πάντων ὅτι τοῖς μὲν ζῶσιν ἅσασιν ὑπεστί τις ἢ πλείων ἢ ἐλάττων φθόνος, τοὺς τεθνεώσας δὲ οὐδὲ τῶν ἐχθρῶν οὐδεὶς ἔτι μισεῖ; Theon seems to prefer Theopompus to Xenophon, and not (like Hermogenes) Xenophon to

Theopompus: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἱστορίας καὶ ὅλους λόγους ἀλλήλοις ἀντιπαραβάλλειν, σκοποῦντα τὸ ἀμεινον ἐξεργασμένον οἷον Δημοσθένους μὲν πρὸς τοὺς Ὑπερίδου, Θεοπόμπου δὲ τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς ἱστορίας πρὸς τὰς Ξενοφώντος (ii. 9).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus refers to Theopompus in the preface to his history, as well as in his critical writings. Speaking of his own guiding principles, he says: . . . οὔτε διαβολὰς καθ' ἑτέρων ἐγνωκὼς ποιείσθαι συγγραφῶν, ὥσπερ Ἀναξίλαος καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐν τοῖς προομίοις τῶν ἱστορίων ἐποίησαν (*Antiqq. Rom.* i. 1): a censure which is confirmed, so far as Theopompus is concerned, from other sources. In the *De Compositione* (c. 23) he gives a short list of writers who have excelled in the elegant style of composition (word-arrangement) and includes in it 'among tragic poets, Euripides alone; among historians, none exactly but Ephorus and Theopompus more than most; among orators, Isocrates.' But it is in the last chapter of his letter to Gnaeus Pompeius Geminus that Dionysius expresses himself most fully with regard to Theopompus' characteristics. The passage is so important that it deserves to be quoted at length:

'Theopompus of Chios was the most celebrated of all the disciples of Isocrates. He composed many panegyrics and many deliberative speeches, as well as the *Chian Letters* and some noteworthy treatises. As a student of history he deserves praise on several grounds. His historical subjects are both good, one of them embracing the conclusion of the Peloponnesian War, the other the career of Philip. The arrangement of his matter is also good, being in both works lucid and easy to follow. Especially admirable are the care and industry which mark his historical writing, for it is clear, even if he had said nothing to that effect, that he prepared himself most fully for his task, and incurred heavy expense in the collection of his material. Moreover, he was an eyewitness of many events, and came in contact with many leading men and generals of his day, whether popular leaders or more cultivated persons. All this he did in order to improve his history. For he did not (as some do) consider the recording of his researches as a pastime, but as the one thing needful in life. The trouble he took may be inferred from the comprehensiveness of his work. He has related the foundation of nations, described the establishment of cities, portrayed royal lives and peculiar habits, and incorporated in his work everything wonderful or strange found on any land or sea. Nor must it be supposed that this merely serves to entertain the

reader. It is not so. Such particulars are, it may in general be said, of the utmost utility.

'In fine, who will not admit that it is necessary for the votaries of philosophical rhetoric to study the various customs both of foreigners and of Greeks, to hear about various laws and forms of government, the lives of men and their actions, their ends and their fortunes? For such votaries he has provided material in all plenty, not divorced from the events narrated, but in close connexion with them. All these qualities of the historian are worthy of admiration. The same may be said of the philosophical reflections scattered throughout his history, for he has many fine observations on justice, piety, and the rest of the virtues. There remains his crowning and characteristic quality, one which is found developed with equal care and effect in no other writer, whether of the older or the younger generation. And what is this quality? It is the gift of seeing and stating in each case not only what is obvious to the multitude, but of examining even the hidden motives of actions and actors, and the feelings of the soul (things not easily discerned by the crowd), and of laying bare all the mysteries of seeming virtue and undiscovered vice. Indeed, I can well believe that the fabled examination, before the judges in the other world, of souls in Hades when separated from the body is of the same searching kind as that which is conducted by means of the writings of Theopompus. In consequence he was thought malicious on the ground that, where criticism of eminent persons was necessary, he added unnecessary details; while in truth he acted like surgeons who cut and cauterize the morbid parts of the system, carrying their operation far down and yet in no way assailing the healthy and normal organs. Such is an account of the way in which Theopompus deals with his subject-matter.

'In style he most resembles Isocrates. His diction is pure, familiar, and clear; it is elevated, grand, and full of stateliness; it is formed according to the middle *harmony*, having a pleasant and easy flow. It differs from that of Isocrates in pungency and energy in some passages, when our author gives free play to his emotions, and particularly when he taxes states or commanders with evil counsels and unjust actions. In such criticisms he abounds, and he falls not one whit behind the intensity of Demosthenes, as may be seen from many other writings and from his *Chian Letters*, in composing which he has obeyed his native instincts. If in the passages on which he has bestowed the greatest pains, he had paid less attention to the blending of vowels, the measured cadence of periods, and the uniformity of constructions, he would have far surpassed himself on the side of literary expression.¹

'He is also guilty of errors in the sphere of subject-matter, and particularly in regard to his digressions, some of which are neither necessary nor opportune, but childish in the extreme. An instance is the story of the Silenus who appeared in Macedonia, and that of the sea-fight between the serpent and the galley,

¹ Cp. Dionys. Hal. *De Comp. Verb.* c. 19 ad f.

and not a few other things of the kind (Dionysius Halic. *Ep. ad Pompeium*, c. 6).'

With this estimate of Theopompus the shorter sketch found in the epitomised *De Imitatione* (ii. 3) is in essential agreement. And what is more important, Dionysius' general view as expressed in the Letter to Pompeius seems to accord well enough with the more scattered notices already quoted from other literary critics. He admits defects, and defects of the same kind as those on which the other critics dwell: for instance, digressions and forced antitheses, the latter being covered by the ὁμοείδεια τῶν σχηματισμῶν of Dionysius (*ad Pomp.* c. 6) and finding an illustration in Demetrius *De Eloc.* § 247 (as quoted above). But, on the whole, he sees in Theopompus an eloquent writer, well fitted to inspire the students of a cultured rhetoric. In fact, he is himself inspired to so much eloquence in the course of his encomium that he excites, as was remarked before the recent discovery was announced, real regret for the loss of so highly praised an author. For the judgment of these Greek critics is usually found to be right, if due account be taken of the point of view they happen to occupy at the moment. Longinus' estimate of Bacchylides was confirmed when the new poems were published by Dr. Kenyon. And the sound literary discrimination of Dionysius has been generally acknowledged. The treatise *De Compositione Verborum*, for example, will be seen to be a most competent piece of work by all readers who remember (1) that its primary subject is the composition, or arrangement, of words, and not composition in some wider sense; and (2) that it is intended chiefly for the use of students of rhetoric. To take a small and rather technical point first: does not Dionysius' suggestion (*De Comp. Verb.* c. 4), for re-arranging a sentence from Herodotus after the manner of Thucydides show a real sense of style? In larger matters, too, he is equally sound. In this same treatise he speaks of the 'old-world and wayward beauty' of Thucydides (ἀρχαϊκὸν τι καὶ αἰσθαδὲς κάλλος, c. 22); and Homer he describes as 'the poet above all others many-voiced' (πολυφωνότατος πάντων τῶν ποιητῶν, c. 16). Here, also, he has preserved

for us Sappho's *Ode to Aphrodite*, Simonides' *Danae*, and a dithyramb of Pindar, while from Homer he quotes just those lines which to all succeeding students, no less than to himself, have seemed best to show that a great poetical genius could also be a cunning literary craftsman. His enthusiasms are clearly sane enthusiasms. And where, as in his essays on the Attic Orators, he is on what is specially his own ground, his excellence as a critic is even more conspicuous, being less obscured by his rather disconcerting habit of applying rhetorical canons to historians and philosophers. Though the plain style is not his ideal style, he is just to Lysias, and praises his purity of expression, his gift of characterisation, his unflinching propriety, his vividness and inimitable charm. Like the author of the *De Sublimitate*, he is liberal in his tastes; and unlike his contemporary Caecilius, he would not allow words such as ἀναγκοφαγῆσαι to spoil his enjoyment of Theopompus. He is fair also to Isocrates, though recognising his limitations,—his excessive regard for smoothness of style, his tameness, and his verbosity. What he admires particularly in him is his essential nobility of aim. 'The strongest exhortations to virtue are to be found in the speeches of Isocrates. I maintain that those who would learn the secret of patriotism, not in part only but in its fulness, should have this orator at their fingers' ends. . . . He proclaims (in one of his speeches) that it is not a large fleet of warships, nor Greeks governed by force, that make a country great, but righteous aims and the succour of the weak (Dionys. Hal. *De Isocr.* cc. 4, 7).'

It is similar qualities in Isocrates' pupil Theopompus that call out the warm admiration of Dionysius. He sees that, like his master, Theopompus has weaknesses of his own. But he finds in him an excellent model for students of the higher rhetoric, whether he be regarded as a moralist or as an orator. Do the new discoveries make a similar impression on the modern reader?

That Theopompus was a severe critic of contemporary morals is attested not only by Dionysius but by Polybius (viii. 11, 12), Lucian (*de conscr. hist.* 59), Plutarch

(*Demosth.* 13), and others. Sometimes he has been thought altogether too severe, but it must not be forgotten that he lived in an age of national decline, when a true Greek might well feel plain-speaking to be a duty.¹ In any case the fact remains that he was a stern moralist. This impression, however, would not naturally be conveyed by the new discoveries, considerable though they are in amount. The unknown author proves himself able to analyse political motive with care and insight, but he does not assume the rôle of a moralist. He rarely blames or praises; he allows his facts to tell their own story. Dionysius, on the contrary, has manifestly before him in Theopompus a preacher of righteousness who probed deep into human vice and forestalled on earth the searching judgments of another world.

Nor can it be said that the new discoveries reveal the orator more clearly than the moralist. That Theopompus had much of the orator about him we know not only from Dionysius but from other authorities. Quintilian, for instance, says: 'Theopompus his proximus ut in historia praedictis minor, ita oratori magis similis, ut qui, antequam est ad hoc opus sollicitatus, diu fuerit orator (*Inst. Or.* x. 1, 74).' And Cicero: 'horum (Philisti et Thucydides) concisis sententiis, interdum etiam non satis apertis cum brevitate tum nimio acumine, officit Theopompus elatione atque altitudine orationis suae (*Brut.* 17, 66).' Some (not all) of the undisputed fragments, also, convey the impression not only of oratorical fire but of rhetorical artifice, e.g. τί γὰρ τῶν αἰσχυρῶν ἢ δεινῶν αὐτοῖς οὐ προσήν; ἢ τί τῶν καλῶν καὶ σπουδαίων οὐκ ἀπὴν;² But the new discoveries (with their apparently deliberate avoidance of speeches where speeches might well have been introduced) do not seem to present us with an accomplished rhetorician, still less with an eloquent orator. They are not in the least likely to have made upon Dionysius the very definite impression which we know Theopompus to have made upon him.

¹ Cp. the fragments in Demetr. *De Eloc.* 240, Athen. vi. 254, Pollux, iii. 58.

² Cp. Gorgias, τί γὰρ ἀπὴν τοῖς ἀνδράσι τοῖτοισι, ὧν δεῖ ἀνδράσι προσεῖναι; τί δὲ καὶ προσήν, ὧν οὐ δεῖ προσεῖναι;

Failing thus to find, in the Oxyrhynchus volume, the kind of writing suggested by Dionysius' eulogy, we may fall back upon the theory that Theopompus (notwithstanding the story about his need of the curb) composed somewhat tamely in his younger days, and in particular was able to suppress his individuality (and even his vanity) when completing another's work. In modern times there are many well-known cases of marked variations in one and the same author's style. There is a great difference between Carlyle when writing in the *Edinburgh Review* and Carlyle when composing his later works. And in classical antiquity such variations might be expected to be even wider, since style was then more deliberately acquired and cultivated. In the first book of Thucydides there is a passage (the story of Cylon, chapters 126-138) which is written with such alluring clearness that a scholiast exclaims 'here the lion smiled.' Nevertheless, no one (so far as I am aware) has questioned the authenticity of the passage on the ground that it is not gnarled and crabbed like many portions of Thucydides, with regard to whose history Dionysius has remarked that 'only a select few are capable of comprehending the whole of Thucydides, and not even they without occasional help in the way of grammatical explanations (*Dionys. Halic. De Thucyd.* c. 51).'

Such considerations as these must certainly be allowed all due weight. Still, the real difficulty remains. It is not a question of mere tricks of style or literary veneer. The *personality* underlying Dionysius' description of Theopompus' style seems quite distinct from that which suggests itself to a reader of the Oxyrhynchus fragments: the two writers seem men of *different characters*. Grenfell and Hunt are fully alive to this aspect of the problem, and they have discussed the whole question with conspicuous fairness and breadth. But a review of the evidence found in Dionysius and elsewhere may perhaps suggest the maintenance of even greater reserve than they have shown when expounding the view that Theopompus may be the author of the new historical fragments.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

NOTES

ON TYRTAEUS, Ἐμβατήρια, 2. 2.

IN the *Classical Review* of June 1900 I endeavoured to prove that κοῦροι ματέρων means not 'sons worthy of your fathers,' as it is commonly translated, but 'genuine citizens.' In support of my view I compared the phrase πατροῦχος παρθένος and also the Latin *patricii* 'fathers' children,' i.e. children begotten in lawful wedlock.

Since writing the above I have come across two other parallels which, I venture to think, may be regarded as strengthening my contention. These are:

(1) The use of the appellation Moplahs (= Ma-pilas, i.e. 'mothers' sons') in the Malabar coast of India—an appellation applied to the descendants of Arab fathers, who came from abroad as conquerors, and indigenous Hindu mothers.

(2) The appellation *ibn abeeey* ('son of his father') by which Ziyad, an illegitimate son of Abu Sufyan, is known in Arabian history. The epithet owes its origin to the fact that in Mohammedan times in Arabia an illegitimate son could not be called by the name of his father, whereas before the advent of Islam a father had the power to give an illegitimate son his name (see *Nafhat ul Yaman*. Tr. by Lieut.-Col. D. C. Phillott, p. 84, n. 2). In all these cases, it will be observed, the expression 'fathers' or 'mothers' sons' has a distinctly legal meaning—such as I believe to be that of the phrase κοῦροι πατέρων.

G. F. ABBOTT.

PLATO, SYMPOSIUM, 219C.

Ποίησαντος δὲ δὴ ταῦτα ἐμοῦ οὗτος τοσοῦτον περιγένετό τε καὶ κατεφρόνησεν καὶ κατέγελασεν τῆς ἐμῆς ὥρας καὶ ὑβρίσεν, καίπερ κείνῳ γε ὦμην τί εἶναι, ὃ ἄνδρες δίκασταί, κτλ.

The Bodleian codex reads, as above, καίπερ κείνῳ γε: T (codex Venetus) has καίπερ ἐκείνῳ γε, which is printed also in Jahn-Usener. Hug, on account of the two solecisms in the Bodleian text, would excise the clause καίπερ . . . εἶναι: Schanz proposed καὶ 'κείνῳ γε: Burnet prints καίτοι 'κείνῳ γε. In a paper

read before the Cambridge Philological Society on March 7, 1907 (see *C.P.S. Proceedings*, lxxvi.-lxxviii. p. 9), I proposed to read καὶ περὶ 'κείνῳ ὃ γε, comparing for the construction ὑβρίζεν περὶ c. acc. *Laws* 885 B. This reading, as I can now claim, is supported by the recently-published Oxyrhynchus fragment of the *Symposium* which gives [καὶ] περὶ ἐκεῖνο γε ὦμην κτλ. It is true that the editors (Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt) attach no importance to this lection, and write 'περὶ, which gives no sense, is doubtless a slip for -περ'; but in writing thus they have evidently failed to take account of the construction of the passage suggested by me. As I construe it, all that is wrong with the Papyrus lection is the omission of the relative after ἐκείνῳ. In favour of περὶ as against περ it may be argued that B is somewhat prone to small sins of omission, and the omission of the letters ιε before κ is a very easy mistake.

R. G. BURY.

NOTE ON PROPERTIUS.

Prop. 1. xx. 32, a dolor ibat Hylas ibat Hamadryasin. (*Enhydriasin*, Postgate.)

Alexander Aetolus (Meineke, *Analecta Alexandrina*, p. 220), preserved in Parthenius, xiv., has this line of one Antheus, who was drowned in a well,

αὐτὸς δ' ἐς Νύμφας ὤχετ' ἐφ' ὑδριάδας.

Νύμφαι ἐφ' ὑδριάδες are twice mentioned in the Anthology, ix. 327 and 329.

It would almost appear that Propertius had read the story of Antheus and Cleobolia in Alexander Aetolus, and this idea had also occurred to Professor Robinson Ellis. Perhaps *Enhydriasin* should be restored here to Propertius: *Enhydrias* seems to be used in a different sense. And Apoll. Rhod., telling the story of Hylas, i. 1207 sq., not only has νύμφη ἐφ' ὑδατίνῃ (1229), but also carefully states that the wood-sprites were away:

αἶψα μὲν ὑλήωροι ἀπὸ πρὸθεν ἐστιχέοντο.

J. U. POWELL.

St. John's College, Oxford.

DIONYSIUS of Halicarnassus (xliii. 26 § 3) in his account of Caesar's reform of the Roman Calendar, remarks in conclusion that the Julian year is slightly too short, and that in 1061 years one additional day needs to be intercalated. This supports the view that the Egyptian year was based on observation of Sirius. Dionysius' statement would make the heliacal rising change, in 1600 years, not by 1.1 days as Oppolzer—probably roughly—gives, but by 1.13100848, and the Sirius period would be, not as Oppolzer's figures

show 1455.99 Egyptian years, but 1455.8834. In *Classical Review* for April, 1900, p. 147, I discussed the question of the Egyptian year, and this passage in Dionysius, which came before me a few weeks back, and which seems to supply the documentary evidence before wanting for Prof. Lockyer's contention, makes me again urge that modern calculations of Sirius' movements should take into account what may be presumed to have been ascertained by Egyptian observation.

T. NICKLIN.

REVIEWS

LATIN ANTHOLOGY.

Anthologia Latina sive Poesis Latinae Supplementum: pars prior (Carmina in Codicibus Scripta). Fasciculus ii. Recensuit A. RIESE. Editio altera denuo recognita. Lipsic: Teubner, 1906. 8vo. Pp. vi + 410. M. 4.

THIS volume of Bücheler and Riese's Latin Anthology was originally published as long ago as 1870, and had been out of print for some years. A new edition had therefore become a necessity, and its appearance will be welcome to all students of this department of later Latin. The first of the two volumes of the Anthologia consists mainly of the contents of one important MS. of the seventh century, the Codex Salmasianus, together with additions from three other MSS. of the ninth and tenth centuries: and it represents, though imperfectly, a collection deliberately made, in Africa, probably towards the closing years of the Vandal kingdom. The sources of this second volume are more scattered and casual. Its contents are drawn from many MSS. from the ninth century (or earlier) onwards, and in some cases from early printed books of which, as regards these pieces, the MS. sources have disappeared. The MSS. drawn upon are scattered all over the libraries of Europe, and the task of collection and collation involves great labour and patience. The limit of inclusion as regards authorship was

fixed by the editor at the end of the sixth century so far as the date can in each case be probably determined. In this new edition a certain number of pieces previously included have been struck out as of Carolingian or later date. Some more, discovered since 1870, have been inserted. As the collection now stands, it gives, with as much accuracy as is attainable, the residuum or sweepings left over when all the major verse authors of the later Empire and the earlier half of the Dark Ages have been accounted for. Fragments of verse quoted in the works of other authors are not given: accentual verse has been altogether omitted: and pieces which are preserved in inscriptions, being now in their proper place in the two volumes of *Epigraphica* which make up the other part of the Latin Anthology, are now struck out from this volume. The order of the contents, as before, follows the probable order of date of the MSS. from which they are taken. Fresh collations have been made of most of these MSS. by the editor and a number of other scholars who have lent their aid: and full account has been taken of the textual work done in Bährens' *Poetae Latini Minores* and elsewhere during the last generation.

Thanks are certainly due to the veteran editor for what must have been tedious and often exasperating labour. The collection is

Poes
E
n
Pro
grap
inter
Latin
Egy
inclu
back
disco
keep
posse
of La
the w
the t
a frie
Phil
appea

indispensable towards a knowledge of later Latin, and in a way towards the history of literature. But to turn over its pages gives a very depressing view of what men of letters did, and what poetry meant, in those long dismal ages. Decadent Latin poetry did not keep the skill and grace of decadent Greek. Throughout may be traced the baleful influence of Ausonius, or rather, of those barren literary schools which Ausonius represents. Here and there, but rarely, as in Ausonius himself, there is just a glimpse of the new poetry that was to come, a premonition of the early Middle Ages. Perhaps the most noticeable feature in the collection is the continuous persistence of the Virgilian tradition, sometimes appearing in the oddest forms, as in the idyl by Pope Damasus beginning *Tityre, tu fido recubans sub tegmine Christi*. In interesting contrast from its mere rarity is the Christian idyl *de Mortibus boum* written in Horatian asclepiads about the time of Claudian. The contents of the volume consist for the

most part of Virgilian centos or epitomes, of school exercises, and of mnemonic verses on grammar or rhetoric, weights and measures, the twelve months and the like. They include perhaps a dozen or so of pieces which can properly be ranked as literature, and even as poetry: some of the pseudo-Vergiliana, the *De ave phoenice* doubtfully attributed to Lactantius, the pretty verses, *De laude horti* and *De rosis nascentibus*, the *Amnis ibat inter herbas* of Tiberianus (in which the mediaeval note is struck with certainty almost for the first time, unless the *Pervigilium Veneris* be ascribed rightly to an earlier date), and a few elegiac pieces like the epitaph on Vitalis, or the *Lecto compositus* which passes under the name of Petronius. In these pieces, and in a few others, there is a grace and fancy which are the more conspicuous from their arid surroundings. The stream of poetry ran very thin, but it never wholly disappeared, then or later.

LATIN POETRY FROM HERCULANEUM.

Poematis Latini fragmenta Herculanensia.

Ed. IOANNES FERRARA. Papiæ ap. officinam typogr. cooperativam. 1908.

PROFESSOR FERRARA gives us in this monograph of 52 octavo pages a valuable and interesting summary of the history of the Latin hexameter poem on the events in Egypt which followed the battle of Actium, including the death of Cleopatra. As far back as 1752, fourteen years after the re-discovery of Herculaneum, Camillo Paderni, keeper of the royal library at Naples, was in possession of a fragment of 8 imperfect lines of Latin which, from the full point by which the words are separated from each other in the two specimen verses sent by Paderni to a friend in England and published in the *Philosophical Transactions* (xlvi. 1):

N. ALTERIVS. DVLC

DEM. CVRIS. CRVDE

appear to have been parts of the same poem

of which more complete remains were brought to light later. The first edition was published in 1809 in vol. ii. of the *Herculanensian volumes* by Ciampitti. This formed the basis of the labours of a series of scholars, Morgenstern, Heyne, Fea, Kreyssig, Weichert, Orelli, Egger, Montanari, Merkel, Riese, and above all, Comparetti.

Meanwhile however a new and more exact examination of the papyrus fragments had been made by an English scholar, John Hayter, quite early in the century (before 1810). These were deposited in the Bodleian and forgotten till 1863, when Professor Theodor Gomperz and Mr. H. O. Coxe succeeded, after a long and laborious search, in finding where they were hidden. I believe I was the first (June, 1863) to make a copy of Hayter's carefully executed pencil-transcripts of the Latin hexameter poem; dissatisfied however with

my attempts at restoration I put aside my copy and notes; and it was not till 1879 (in vol. i. of Bährens' *Poetae Lat. Minores*, p. 212 sqq.) that Hayter's draft of the Latin poem was actually utilized, Mr. Coxe having sent to him a copy of the eight columns which Hayter had engraved. Bährens' edition was in 1885 supplemented by Professor Walter Scott's *Fragmenta Herculanensia*, which, though mainly busied with the Greek papyri, contains new and important details as to the Latin. Professor Ferrara has cited these on p. 12. The appearance of Professor Scott's volume revived my own interest, and in 1887 I published (*Journ. Philology*, pp. 82-86) a paper of emendations of the eight columns which Hayter had engraved and which are added as an appendix at the end of Scott's volume.

The author of the poem is, after the lapse of a century of discussion, unknown. It was at first thought to be by Varius, whom Horace speaks of as unrivalled in epic song (*Sat.* i. 10. 44); Egger in a work published in 1843 thought Albinus, a poet from whom Priscian quotes three hexameters containing two instances of *cūi* disyllable, might be the author; the latest and prevalent view supports the ascription to Rabizius. Egger's hypothesis has never found much favour; a *Panegyricus Augusti*, such as Porphyryon ascribes to Varius, would doubtless have addressed Octavianus far more personally than we find anywhere in the fragments of our poem; and the extant hexameters from Varius' *de morte* have peculiarities of rhythm which are nowhere admitted in these. As to Rabizius, whom Ovid styles *magni oris*, and of whom we possess part of one hexameter quoted by Seneca, *Hoc habeo quodcumque dedi*, it may be said that the poem is not *inconsistent* with either of these data, for there is a dignity, not to say grandiloquence, in all the eight completer fragments, which might not inaptly be spoken of as *magnum os*, and the rhythmical break in the middle of the 4th foot in the line quoted by Seneca recurs in the same eight columns, as well as in the more broken remains facsimiled by Professor Ferrara. What is more,

the line *Hoc habeo quodcumque dedi* is not only stated by Seneca to be by Rabizius, but to occur in a speech of Antonius, thus far agreeing with the subject of our poem, in which the last agonies of Antonius and Cleopatra were recorded. Rabizius, notwithstanding, is not thought by Ferrara to be the writer of the Herculanensian poem; he finds it too mediocre to be assignable to one whom Ovid obviously admired, Velleius Paterculus ranked with Vergil, Sallust, Livy, Tibullus, Ovid, that is, with the greatest poets and historians of the Augustan age. On this point I must express my dissent from Ferrara; the language, to my judgment, is of the best and purest; the rhythm telling and effective; the whole impressive, perhaps even comparable with the *Pharsalia*, without any trace of its obscurity.

Bährens' indefatigable industry no doubt did a great deal for the restoration of the eight larger fragments; it could not be otherwise, possessed as he was, not only of Ciampitti's Naples edition, but the copy made before 1810 by the Etonian Hayter. Final, however, Bährens' edition is not; for not only are many of the lacunae in these fragments recoverable by conjecture, but other fragments still remain in the Bodleian (as Professor W. Scott was the first to point out) on which criticism may still be usefully employed. It is one chief merit of Professor Ferrara's monograph that he has called new attention to these, and given facsimiles of them executed by an artist of the Clarendon Press, under the direction of its able controller, Mr. Horace Hart. What the exact value of these other fragments is, it is not easy to pronounce, owing to their disjointed form and the faintness in many cases of the pencilled copies made either by Hayter himself or by his employees. So far as I have examined them, they rarely present anything like a tolerably complete line; yet such truncated remains as

[VIR]GINEOS . PARAT . ILLA . CHOROS

followed by

MISCE[T] . [Q]VE . MARES . I[N]PVBERIS . [ÆVI]

suggest a motley scene, which we should be glad to recover more completely.

I have one new conjecture to offer on the poem. It is in fragment vi. 44 (Ferrara, p. 48). It is to read

[Hic] iacet [absumptus] ferro, *putris* ille ueneno est;
the *p* of *putris* I suppose to have been

erroneously facsimiled as *z*, to which letter, in the capitals employed by the original copyist of our poem, it bears a close resemblance (TP).

ROBINSON ELLIS.

MENANDER.

Menandri Quatuor Fabularum Fragmenta.
J. VAN LEEUWEN, J.F. Leyden: Sijthoff,
1908. 8vo. Pp. 111. 5s. 6d.

Restorations of Menander. W. HEADLAM.
Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1908. Pp.
31. 1s.

THE new Menander is rapidly taking shape. In its first published form it contained much that was strange and not a few things that were impossible, many small gaps filled up not very well or not at all, many clear errors of the papyrus allowed to pass as correct. The discoverer and first editor, to whom we are so much indebted, had given (we may suppose) more time to the decipherment of the text than to its treatment when deciphered, and no doubt the former was a hard task enough. There are many indications that even that part of the work is not completely done. The contributions made by various scholars are often of such a kind that we wonder whether the papyrus does not in reality present what they propose. No doubt corruption has frequently taken place, but suspicions of not quite exact reading will also occur to the mind, and there are very many letters marked by Mr. Lefebvre himself as doubtful. It is therefore satisfactory to hear that the dim torn fragments are being subjected to further independent scrutiny, and one may hope that a good deal of fresh light will thus be thrown upon the text. Things that have been suggested may perhaps be found actually written there: things that have not been thought of may emerge to remove some of our doubts and difficulties.

A large percentage of the corrections proposed so far have naturally been such as to occur to very many scholars at once.

Often small, sometimes considerable though fairly obvious, they were sure to be made by a large number of readers as soon as the papyrus was published. In the text as recast in van Leeuwen's edition these indubitable improvements are in large measure introduced, and Menander may there be read in a form that is in many places certainly more correct and in others certainly more plausible than that of the *editio princeps*. In corrections of this easy kind priority of publication is not very important, but it is Wilamowitz-Moellendorf to whom the larger part of them are to be credited, as having appeared first with his name. I do not mean that his proposals are confined to these easy and obvious things, for often they go much beyond this and show, as we should expect, much knowledge and acuteness. The conjecture of other scholars too, so far as they had been published at the time, are embodied in the text or given in the notes. Crusius, van Herwerden, Grenfell and Hunt, contribute in this way. The editor himself has made many suggestions, often of a valuable sort. I cannot, however, think that he does right when he prints boldly in the body of his text all sorts of restorations, his own or those of others, even in passages where the papyrus through mutilation fails us altogether and not a letter is preserved, so that any restoration must often be of a more than doubtful nature. When in a line a single word is wanting, it is often uncertain what that word was, since many satisfy the conditions and are possible; still more is this the case when several words have to be supplied, as the conjectural supplements already suggested in the present instance abundantly show. A reader may tax his

ingenuity in these circumstances and may offer a very plausible restoration, but I hardly think it should be inserted in the text, for many others are or may be suggested of equal plausibility. They are indeed likely enough to be all wrong together, and in any case we are almost certainly precluded from knowing for certain whether any one of them is right. Speaking as one who has himself taken part in the game, I should say that, though such conjectures are reasonable and welcome, they ought always to be kept in the notes, not promoted to the text. There is also the further reason for this, that in many cases (I believe) the reception of them into the text checks to some extent further thought on the subject by suggesting a certainty that does not exist and tends to make scholars acquiesce too soon in things which are after all of no authority whatever. One improvement of great importance in van Leeuwen's text made at the same time by himself and Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, is the transference to the *Περικειρομένη* of a considerable fragment assigned by Lefebvre to the *Σαμία*. Of the correctness of this change there need be no doubt. I may just draw attention in

passing to an oversight on p. 72, where van Leeuwen allows *ἐπειτ' ἄκοιτι* to stand at the beginning of an iambic line in spite of the long *a* in *ἄκοιτι*, and to the reverse error in *Ἦρος* 14 (33), where he is content with the *καταρῶ* given by the papyrus, as though the second *a* were long, instead of adding a *μοι* as it is pretty clear that we ought to do.

Dr. Walter Headlam has made many of the corrections above mentioned that were fairly obvious to scholars, at any rate to those who were at all practised in the treatment of Greek texts, and has added to them many of a less easy kind. His fine scholarship appears, as usual, not only in the conjectures which he puts forward, but in the illustrations and general wealth of learning by which they are supported. In the *Comic Fragments* he is at home and able to quote very appositely. His temper is less adventurous than van Leeuwen's, whose proposals here as in *Aristophanes* may perhaps occasionally be described by a line in one of the new fragments themselves, *οὐχ εὔρεσις τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀλλ' ἀφαίρεσις*.

H. RICHARDS.

HOMERIC VOCABULARIES.

Homeric Vocabularies: Greek and English Word-Lists for the Study of Homer. By WILLIAM BISHOP OWEN, Ph.D., and EDGAR JOHNSON GOODSPEED, Ph.D. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1906. Pp. viii + 62. 50 cents, net.

To those who believe in the systematic study of vocabularies, the title of this little book has a hopeful sound. And doubtless the book itself may fulfil its purpose reasonably well in the hands of many teachers. Yet it seems as if it might easily have been made much more useful. The object of such a list should be to enable the student to fix the meaning of as many important words as possible in his mind with the least possible labour. And this can hardly be

accomplished with the present book. First of all its arrangement strikes one as faulty. The Greek words and the English are in separate halves of the book, nor do the Greek and their meanings even occupy corresponding places on their respective pages. Much less laborious, certainly, for the learner would have been an arrangement of both on the same page in parallel columns. The words are further separated into three groups, verbs, nouns, and, thirdly, the other parts of speech together, and in each group its members are separated into a half-dozen lists according to the frequency of their occurrence in Homer. This plan has some advantages, but, on the other hand, the labour of memorizing is unquestionably much increased: related words and even different

forms of the same word are widely separated (e.g. *τανύω*, *τείνω*, *τιταίνω* are Nos. 151, 275, 504 respectively); nor are words of similar form but different meaning placed in proper juxtaposition so that the student may be put on his guard and not confuse them.

The choice of meanings, too, is not above reproach. They are, we may say, almost entirely chosen from the English translation of Autenrieth's *Homeric Dictionary*, as but a brief glance will show, and although meanings of words may not be subject to copyright, it might have been well if the editors had acknowledged their indebtedness. Unfortunately, also, they are not always chosen wisely. For example, *τελέθω* is 'Am become, assume,' where 'assume' is worse than useless; so with *πειρηγίζω*, 'Test, sound.' For *τρωπάω* (a word which, so far as Ebeling's *Lexicon* shows, does not occur the ten times the editors claim for it) we have 'Change, vary,'—entirely unsuitable meanings except for a single passage. Again one might reasonably expect to find identical meanings given for parallel forms of the same word. But quite the opposite is often the case. Thus *λανθάνω* is 'Escape notice, forget,' *λήθω* is only 'Escape notice'; *κεδάννυμι* is 'Scatter,' *σκεδάννυμι* and *σκιδναμαι* 'Scatter, disperse,' for no apparent reason. And in general why should so many useless synonyms be given? Why should *ἔγχος* be 'Spear, lance' or *θύρη*, 'Door, gate'? It seems obvious that unless a word has more than one *distinct* signification, only a single

meaning should be set down. For if the meanings are to be committed absolutely to memory one is easier to learn than two; if not, the method of wide and rapid reading would seem preferable to fooling with a word-list. Among other meanings susceptible of improvement are those of *μεγάθυμος*, 'Great-hearted,'—a mere school-boy's rendering—and *ἡβάζω*, 'Am at my youthful prime,'—enough to make even a school-boy laugh. All of which goes to show that the meanings must have been selected in a very haphazard fashion.

Additional information would be desirable in some cases: thus the meaning of active and middle of such verbs as *ἄπτω* and *λανθάνω* ought to have been differentiated. To have the Attic forms given in words like *πρήσσω* and *θηέομαι* would be helpful, though it may not be necessary; so also the Attic meaning, where this varies widely from the Homeric, as in *φοβέω*, *ἀρκέω*, *ἀσκέω*. And none of these additions would overload the book.

I have noticed a few misprints: *δύνω* occurs twice (Nos. 46 and 201, and with varying meanings in the two places); No. 407, *κορέω*, 'Sweep'—a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*—should be *κορέννυμι*, 'Satisfy'; at No. 474, for 'Cover,' read 'Cower'; at No. 521, for 'place,' read 'plan'; noun No. 198 should be defined 'olive-oil,' not 'olive, oil.'

WM. W. BAKER.

Haverford College.

COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.

An Introduction to Comparative Philology for Classical Students. By J. M. EDMONDS, M.A. Cambridge: University Press, 1906. Pp. viii + 235. 4s. net.

COMPARATIVE Philology seems lately to have lost some of its interest, and it is now less commonly taught in schools than it was 15 or 20 years ago. The cause of this change is, no doubt, to be sought in the greater complexity of the science, where no great principles remain to be discovered, and

workers are confined to the elaboration of details.

The shorn and parcell'd Oxus strains along
Through beds of sand and matted rushy isles.

How different it was in the early eighties, when the sonant nasal and the velar guttural swam into our ken!

Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
But to be young was very heaven!

The decline of the science in school teaching is much to be regretted, though it is not

surprising in the present congested state of our curriculum. If it is to be taught at all, a short text book is needed, which must not try to cover too much ground. Even Mr. Giles' admirable Manual is too full for a school class book. Mr. Edmonds has now attempted to fill the gap with a short introduction, in which the main principles are explained within the compass of 200 pages.

We may at once say that the book has two merits. In the art of selection Mr. Edmonds shows the tact of the practical teacher; he rejects much that may seem to others essential, and yet he retains enough detail to interest a school-boy, and quicken his memory without causing him to lose sight of the main principles. Secondly, the examples are lively and often original, especially those chosen from English. These two qualities should make the book a success in the hands of any schoolmaster who knows something more of his subject than Mr. Edmonds chooses to tell him.

The book begins with a very clear account of the classification of sounds. The account is quite full enough: indeed, it is possible in practice to carry the simplification of phonetics still further. The affinities of the Indo-European languages are then described, and a very good summary is given of the

historical development of Greek, Latin, and English. Here, in particular, much judgment is shown in selection. The chapter on change, phonetic and otherwise, is admirably illustrated by examples from English, and some prominence is given to the youngest branch of the science—Semantics, sufficient at least to set the intelligent boy thinking about the history of meanings. Vowel-gradation and Grimm's Law are next expounded, and capital examples are given from English to illustrate Verner's Law. Consonants in Greek and Latin are carefully treated, but to the vowels, perhaps wisely, only two pages are assigned, and the book concludes with a short sketch of the history of Comparative Philology.

It will be seen that the author elects to stop short of Morphology and Comparative Syntax, which for Classical Students, for whom Mr. Edmonds caters, form the *pièce de résistance* of the meal. The book, therefore, can only be regarded as an introduction in the strict sense of the term. We cannot, however, quarrel with the author for not doing what he has not professed to do. The book may be heartily recommended; it is very free from mistakes or misprints, and is provided with full indexes.

J. H. V.

SHORT NOTICES

De Ovidio Poeta Commentatio. Scripsit J. J. HARTMAN in Univ. Lugd. Bat. Prof. Ord. Lugduni Batavorum: E. J. Brill, 1905. Pp. 155. M. 3.

PROF. HARTMAN writes Latin with agreeable fluency, and this gift combined with modesty and a naive habit, no doubt induced by the use of a dead language, of taking the reader into his confidence does not dispose us to deal with him harshly; but, with the best intentions, we really cannot regard his Essays as a valuable contribution to the study of Ovid. The first two chapters treat of matters metrical, but *e.g.* the conclusion 'Poetae

Latini legem de vitanda caesura (κατὰ τέταρτον τροχαῖον) non ignorarunt, sed nosse se eam dissimularunt' is not likely to commend itself to scholars. There follows a contention that the last books of the *Metamorphoses* from xiii. 400 onwards exhibit less finish than the preceding ones. Unfortunately many of the instances quoted are entirely illusory. A single example will suffice (p. 23) (*Met.* xiii. 754) of Acis:

Signarat teneras molli lanugine malas.

'Restat ergo ut ipse Acis suas malas lanugine signasse dicatur, quod tum demum sermonis Latini naturae convenienter dictum

erit, si rem quam maxime fingemus ridiculam: barbulam falsam agglutinasse malis suis puerum.'

The note displays an astonishing ignorance of a common idiom. The same topic—the haste shown in the composition of these last books—is further developed in Ch. V, and the volume also contains a discussion of Ovid's method of composition, a lively essay on the cause of his exile with a defence of the *Ars Amatoria* and the remarkable suggestion that Livia and Tiberius were offended by two lines (*Met.* i. 147–8) in the description of the iron age, and lastly numerous annotations on passages in the *Metamorphoses*.

In conclusion it may be remarked that 'mota manus procerum' (*Met.* xiii. 382) does certainly not mean a moving of hands with a view to voting.

H. L. HENDERSON.

Euripides, The Heraclidae. Edited by A. C. PEARSON, M.A. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1907. 7" x 4½". Pp. xl + 166.

MR. PEARSON is well qualified to edit this play. He has a good knowledge of Greek and especially of the language of tragedy. He has worked through all that has been written about the play from Barnes onwards; he has weighed it all carefully and has formed his own conclusions. Hence, though he owes much to Elmsley, Pflugk, Wecklein, Murray, and especially Wilamowitz, both the commentary and the text have an independent value. The following changes in the text may be mentioned: 592 τῆς for καί, 610 'μβεβάναι, 948–9 placed after 950–1. The notes show real insight into the language: the examples quoted as illustrations are unusually well chosen. But the ordinary student, the sixth form boy for instance or undergraduate reading for honours, will find the commentary a little hard to read because the editor has tried to include so much. Hence many notes are unduly compressed: to get the sense, one has to read them several times, omitting the parentheses. The book would be more generally useful if the editor had touched on fewer points and commented on them more fully. One example must

suffice. '533. εὐρημα could not be combined with ἡρῶν' without an attribute, unless it had come to connote something more than the verb, and in spite of *El.* 606 it is probable that Euripides would have shrunk from so employing it.' The substance of this note is given also on 77 and 990. In all three places the noun has an attribute, so that the notes do not make the passages any clearer. But if the note is given at all, it should be fuller; one wants an instance of a verb combined with a cognate noun which has 'come to connote something more than the verb,' and one wants to know why in *El.* 606 the rule is broken. The editor often gives references to Goodwin and to Kuehner-Gerth, occasionally to Rutherford and to Gildersleeve. In an edition like this intended for 'students in the higher forms of schools, and at the universities' the references to the large German work are not of much value. But it would add much to the usefulness of the commentary, if references to the other three works were given far more liberally. For example, Mr. Pearson's note on l. 40 gives excellent illustrations from tragedy of the *nominativus pendens*; a reference to Gild. *S.C.G.* 10 shows how wide-spread this use of the case was in other kinds of Greek. The editor should give fuller information about the books referred to: Gildersleeve's *Syntax of Classical Greek* is not easily obtained without the name of the publisher; nor is Mueller's *Handbuch* a sufficient title.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung . . . herausg. von G. WISSOWA. XI^{ter} Halbband: Ephoros-Eutychos. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1907. 1536 columns. Mk. 15.

THIS half volume of the indispensable Pauly-Wissowa brings us nearly to the end of the letter E. Not to mention the many important articles which one naturally looks for and finds under proper names in this part of the alphabet, we note those on 'Epigramm,' 'Equites Romani,' and 'Equites singulares,' and 'Etymologika.' The editor has apportioned the space with his usual good judgment, except, if we may say so, in the case of the

article on donkeys. Why 'Esel,' by Olck, should be spread over 50 columns, while 'Euripides' is content with less than 40, and 'Epikuros' with 23, it is hard to say; but the articles on agricultural economy, as we have pointed out before now, certainly tend to excessive length, even when we consider that such information is not easily accessible elsewhere. Another criticism which requires repetition concerns a number of articles on small cities such as Epiphaneia, Eriza, Etenna, Eucarpia, Eumeneia. The references to the numismatic literature under these and some other headings are quite inadequate and misleading. One would not, for instance, learn from this volume that the Cilician Epiphaneia was called Trajanopolis, or Eumeneia called Fulvia, or that Eurymenai struck coins at all. Some articles on cities, signed by Büchner, on the other hand, betray a proper sense that a reference to Head's *Historia Numorum* (now twenty years old) does not absolve a topographical writer from consulting later publications, even though they be in English. A few small points, which will perhaps receive attention in the next supplement, may be relegated to a footnote.¹

G. F. HILL.

¹ *Epimeletes*: this title is also found at Mastaura. On it, and on the verbal form *ἐπιμελητής*, see H. von Fritze in *Nomisma* i. p. 2f. *Epiphanes*: the religious significance of this regal title might have procured it more than the five words in which it is dismissed. King Epiphanes of Commagene (72 A.D.) is omitted. *Epiphora*: in the sense of an extraordinary contribution (*J.G.* i. 37) this word requires explanation. So does *Epinikia*, in the sense of an agonistic festival (as on the coins of Tarsus and Anazarbus). *Episemon* (shield-device) is quite inadequately dealt with. See especially Chase's article on the subject in *Harvard Studies*, xiii. *Eppillus*: son of Commius, king of the Kentish district, is omitted. *Erchomenos*: the epigraphic form of the city-name Orchomenos, was worth a cross reference. *Ergetium*: the numismatic question of Ergetium-Sergentium (raised long ago by de Luynes) should have been touched upon, although the recent discussions by de Foville (*Rev. Num.* 1907), and Pais (in his 'Ancient Italy') were not available. Prof. Pais' book should also be consulted on *Eryx* and *Euthymos*. *Erion*: the Thelpusian name for the horse Arion, requires an entry: so does the title *Ethnarchos*. The most serious omission we have noticed is in the case of *Euelthon*, the well-known king of Salamis. Other less famous Cypriote rulers, known only from their coins, such as *Epipalos* of Amathus (?), *Eteandros* of Paphos, and *Euanthes* of

Die Götter des Martianus Capella und der Bronzeleber von Piacenza. Von CARL THULIN. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1906. 8vo. Pp. iv+92. Two Illustrations in Text and one Plate. M. 2.80.

MR. THULIN begins by referring the list of gods in Martianus Capella (i. 41-61) to an Etruscan origin, herein following Deecke. For the sixteen regions over which the gods are distributed point clearly to the Etruscan theory of lightning. By comparing Martianus' list with the inscriptions upon the bronze liver which was found at Piacenza in 1877, it is possible to interpret the Etruscan inscriptions upon the bronze, and to identify the deities to whom they refer. Thus the two parts of the Etruscan doctrine, namely, the inspection of entrails and the augury by lightning, are brought together and associated with certain gods. Mr. Thulin makes some advance upon the results which have already been attained by Deecke (pp. 22 ff.). Although the name of Minerva is probably Italian, it is interesting to trace certain Etruscan traits in her cult at Rome and to understand a little better the trinity of the Capitoline temple (p. 40).

Astrology is also brought in to explain the distribution of the deities in the schemes of Martianus and of the bronze. Here however the identifications and the comparisons are less convincing. But it seems more than probable from the evidence adduced that the Roman Calendar was largely influenced by Etruscan ideas and 'that the Etruscans here, as in other cases, were the first intermediaries of the wisdom springing from the East' (p. 78). Some current ideas about primitive Roman religion will undoubtedly require modification in the light of all this.

Lastly Mr. Thulin, tracing the sources of Martianus Capella, refers the list of the gods through Pliny the Elder to Nigidius (p. 88).

Mr. Thulin is not original in postulating a masculine Ceres (p. 47). He is anticipated by Preller's *Römische Mythologie*,³ i. 81. Again (p. 50) it seems dangerous to refer a

Salamis, have also escaped. Finally, *Eurea*, a Thessalian city which issued some pretty coins; the nymph *Eurymedusa* of Selinus, and *Eupator*, king of Bosporus about 155-171 A.D., find no mention.

positive and complex religion to a primitive philosophy of nature, as the author does, when he conjectures 'that according to the Etruscan belief the rose colour of the dawn, as forerunner of the light, was mother of the sun.' However the author has made an interesting and valuable contribution to Etruscan studies.

F. GRANGER.

Kenyon and Bell's British Museum Papyri: Facsimiles.
Vol. iii. London: H. Froude and Others, 1907.
Folio. With 100 collotypes. £3 3s.

THE third volume of the Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the British Museum, of which a notice appeared in the *Classical Quarterly* for October, is accompanied, as were its predecessors, by a splendid series of facsimiles. These are issued separately in a portfolio, and consist of one hundred admirably executed collotype reproductions, which leave but few decades unrepresented between the middle of the second century B.C. and the end of the sixth A.D., and include also a few specimens of seventh and early eighth century writing. The most serious lacuna is to be found in the fifth century, which is illustrated by a solitary example. For some obscure reason documents of that period have until recently been remarkably scarce; fortunately the discoveries at Oxyrhynchus will make good this deficiency. To the student of early Greek palaeography the new series of plates supplies material of the utmost value. The authorities of the British Museum have in this direction set an excellent example, which in view of the growing importance of papyrological research might with advantage be more widely imitated.

A. S. HUNT.

A STATEMENT is made by WILLIAM AITON in his '*Treatise on the origin, qualities, and cultivation of moss earth*' (Glasgow, 1805) that Archimedes in building his big ship had to send to Britain for one of his masts.

Now in Athenaeus, vol. i. Bk. E, marginal page 208 (Dindorf edition, 1827), we read that 'The first and second masts were (easily) procured, but the third mast was found with difficulty by a swineherd in the mountains of the Bruttii (*Bperrias*, v.l. *Bperrias*, *Bperrias*), and an engineer of Tauromenium brought it down to the sea.'

No good text (Teubner's last edition included) retains the reading *Bperrias*, and it is clear from the context that the mast was found on the mainland of South Italy, (where a tall species of pine called the Calabrian pine still grows, I am informed, in Calabria and the Bruttii country), and was brought down to the sea-shore and thence carried across the Strait of Messina. It is highly improbable that, if trees of the requisite height grew so close to Syracuse on

the mainland, Archimedes would have sent to Britain, supposing that there was any timber trade at that early date between Britain and Italy. Has this legend found its way into any other works bearing on the early trade of the British Isles with the Continent, and is there any other authority besides the various reading in Athenaeus for the statement made by Mr. Aiton?

H. T. FRANCIS.

The Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria. By G. DENNIS. London: J. M. Dent. 2 vols. n.d. (1907?). (Everyman's Library.) Cloth, 4s.

A REISSUE of this well-known work in so handy a form would be most acceptable were it not for the fact that it is reprinted from the first edition of 1848, and not from the thoroughly revised second edition, which appeared thirty years later, and which is still, no doubt, protected by the Copyright Acts.¹ It thus does not embody the results of Mr. Dennis' latest researches, and omits the descriptions, e.g., of several tombs at Corneto which were discovered in the intervening thirty years, and one or two chapters which were added to the second edition. Of this fact, however, no hint, so far as I have been able to discover, is given, either by Professor W. M. Lindsay in the editor's preface, which he contributes (at the end of which both the editions are cited), or elsewhere in the course of the work. Such a proceeding is hardly fair either to the author himself nor to the public, who may (as happened to the present writer) meet with unpleasant surprises when they attempt to use it as a guide on the spot. Professor Lindsay's remark that 'since it was written a good deal has been added to our knowledge of the subject' is true in a sense which he can hardly have intended.

T. A.

NEW EDITIONS.

WE are glad to see that Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Cambridge University Press) has appeared in a second edition. A cheap edition of Munro's translation of Lucretius has been published by Bell (5s.), and the Greek text of Prof. Mackail's *Selections from the Anthology* has been printed separately in a pocket edition (Longmans, 2s. cl., 3s. lthr. net). Prof. Burrows's *Crete* has also gone into a second edition, or rather a reprint with a few pages added to bring in the latest results. Apparently scholars are not content with the Cnossian palace as labyrinth, for another labyrinth is here suggested in a large *tholos* or 'underground Bull temple' (p. 245). The appendix contains some new evidence as to dating the remains, and a comparison of ancient Servian pottery with Cretan.

¹ The third edition of 1883 is, as far as I am aware, a reissue of that of 1878.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

THE Classical Association of Ireland has begun its existence; and Mr. S. H. Butcher's Presidential Address is now before us, together with Rules and List of Members. The address deals with the value of classical study as a 'training in interpretation;' a thing likely to be useful in practical life, besides giving a discriminating power to the mind. There are over two hundred members: may there soon be two thousand!

OUR readers may be interested to know of a journal called the *Classical Weekly*, published in New York. Each number contains eight pages. It is published by the Classical Association for the Middle States and Maryland: to outsiders, one dollar a year.

WE are glad to chronicle the establishment at Adelaide of a Classical Association for South Australia, under the auspices of Professor Darnley Naylor, a contributor to the *Classical Review* and *Quarterly*. The Association has adopted the scheme of Latin pronunciation put out by the *Classical Association*, and an agreement was reached on the reform of Greek pronunciation also. We may hope that it will follow the example of South Africa and affederate to the British Society.

WE regret to see from Bonn the announcement of Franz Bücheler's death. In our next issue we hope to have an obituary notice of him.

ARCHAEOLOGY

MONTHLY RECORD.

AFRICA.

Tunis.—A fragment of a marble inscription was lately discovered which evidently belongs to another fragment found thirteen years ago at the same place. Between the two parts of the slab is a small gap, which M. Gauckler, who publishes the text, has attempted to fill. His reading is:

*Cerne salutiferas splendentis marmore Baias,
qui calidos aestus tingere quæris aquis,
hic ubi Vulcano Neirine certat amore,
nec nequit unda fœces, nec nocet ignis aquis;
gaude operi Gebamundiacæ; regalis origo
delictis sospes; utere cum populo.*

The verses are compared with many similar pieces in the Anthology, especially the five short poems of Flavius Felix which celebrate the baths built by Thrasamund at Alïanae, and the conjectural restorations are based on these. Thus the adjective *Gebamundiacus* is modelled on *Thrasamundiacus* of Felix, and is also supported by the fact that a Vandal prince Gibamund is mentioned by Procopius as having taken a prominent part in the battle of Ad Decimum. This person may actually have been the founder of the baths. The inscription is a fine example of sixth century epigraphy.¹

El-Haouria.—A mosaic pavement, which came to light last year in a Roman house, contains an interesting representation of the contest between Athena and Poseidon for the dominion of Attica. The god and goddess stand one on either side of a Victory, whose identity is marked by wings and a palm-branch. She is seated at a table and is in the act of drawing from an urn the votes which have been cast by the judges; but who these were, the twelve gods, or the royal family, or the people of Attica, there is no means of deciding. Every record of this myth is valuable, in the possibility that it may throw light upon the interpretation of the figures from the West Pediment of the Parthenon. This version occurs in a marble relief which was found at Aphrodisias in Caria and is now at Smyrna (C. Robert in *Athenische Mittheilungen*, 1882), but the artist of the mosaic has changed many details of the prototype. Thus Athena's olive tree, owl, snake and shield are omitted; Poseidon's trident has become a staff, and the rock, from which the spring was drawn, has vanished, though the foot which rested on the rock is still raised. Yet the general similarity of the two is so remarkable as to set it beyond doubt that there is a direct connection between them.¹

The British Museum.

E. J. FORSDYKE.

¹ *Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr.*, Décembre, 1907.

VERSIONS AND COMPOSITIONS

DE ARTE TONSORIS,

OR ADVICE TO A YOUNG SHAVER.

Radendo mentum, Barbatule Mulle, caueto,
ne tepida setas aggrediari aqua.
ferueat igne recens, fumosque allata uolucres
proiciat; dulci, corripe membra, linque toro
protinus inuadas faciem: qui cautior haeret,
perditur: in molli res peragenda cute est.
ergo etiam indutus nocturna veste, lauacri

* Sale, 133 Oxford Street.

immemor, incipias, neu graue differ opus.
* Mercurii nota saponem quaere taberna:
unge resistentes terque quaterque rubos.
radat et obliquo demissa nouacula tractu,
qui scaber hesternis sentibus horret. agrum.
si sequitur sanguis, placandus sanguine forsan
votivo ferri Mulciber auctor erat.

E. D. S.

TO THE BABE NIVA.

NIVA, child of Innocence,
Dust to dust we go;
Thou, when Winter wooed thee hence,
Wentest snow to snow.

TABB.

Pulvere nos ortos, Niva, qua nil purius,
infans,

Deducto Lachesi stamine pulvis habet;
Tu, simul invitavit hiems glacialis, abisti
Quam cito! cognatae nix socianda nivi.

H. W. MOSS.

Ἡμεῖς μὲν, κύνες αὐτοί, ἐλευσόμεθ', ὃ βρέφος
ἄγνόν,
πρὸς κόνιν οἰκείην, εἶτ' ἂν ἔλῃ θάνατος·
παῖ, σὺ δέ, χεიმῶνος μεταπεψμαμένου κρυόεντος,
οἰκαδ' ἔπειτ' ἦλθες, πρὸς χιονάς τε χίων.

R. C. SEATON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of Books is given in inches: 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly). They are unbound unless the binding is specified.

. *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Apuleius. Apulei Opera quae supersunt. Vol. III. Apulei Platonici Madaurensis de philosophia libri, recensuit Paulus Thomas. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xviii + 200. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1908. Geh. M. 4; geb. M. 4.40.

Aristophanes. Prolegomena ad Aristophanem. Scripsit J. van Leeuwen, J.F. 8vo. Pp. 445. Leyden, Sijthoff. 1908. 10s.

Baumgarten (Fritz), Poland (Franz) und Wagner (Richard) Die Hellenische Kultur dargestellt von F. B., F. P., und R. W. Zweite starkvermehrte Auflage. 10" x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii + 530, mit 7 farbigen Tafeln, 2 Karten und über 400 Abb. im Text und auf 2 Doppeltafeln. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1908. Geh. M. 10; geb. M. 12.

British Museum. Excavations at Ephesus. The Archaic Artemisia, by David George Hogarth, with Chapters by Cecil Harcourt Smith, LL.D., Keeper, and Arthur Hamilton Smith, M.A., Assistant

Keeper, of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities; by B. V. Head, D.C.L., late Keeper of the Department of Coins and Medals; and by Arthur E. Henderson, R.B.A. Text, 11 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 9". Pp. xiv + 344, 52 plates and 101 figures in the text. Atlas, 22" x 15". 18 plates. London, Printed by Order of the Trustees. 1908. Cloth, 50s.

Cagnat (R.) Les deux camps de la légion III^e Auguste à Lambèse d'après les fouilles récentes. (Extrait des *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. Tome XXXVIII. 1^{re} Partie.) 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 9". Pp. 64 and 5 plates. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale; Librairie C. Klincksieck. 1908.

Carotti (Dr. G.) A History of Art by Dr. G. C. Complete in four volumes. Volume I. Ancient Art, revised by Mrs. Arthur Strong, Litt.D., LL.D. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxviii + 420; with 540 illustrations. London, Duckworth & Co. 1908. Cloth, 5s. net.

- Chase* (George H.) The Loeb Collection of Arretine Pottery. Catalogued, with introduction and descriptive notes, by G. H. C. 11½" × 8½". Pp. viii + 168 and 23 plates. New York, The Laurentian Press. 1908. Stiff paper-boards (?).
- Cicero*. Scholia Ciceronis orationes Bobiensia, edidit Paulus Hildebrant. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7½" × 4½". Pp. xlviii + 308 and 2 plates. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1908. Geh. M. 8; geb. M. 8.40.
- Colasanti* (Giovanni) Pinna. Ricerche di Topografia e di Storia. (*Biblioteca di Geografia Storica*, pubblicata sotto la direzione di Giulio Beloch. Volume II.) 10" × 6½". Pp. 126, con una pianta. Roma, Ermanno Loescher. 1907. Lire 5.
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum editum consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis*.
Vol. L. Pseudo-Augustini quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII. Accedit appendix continens alterius editionis quaestiones selectas, recensuit Alexander Souter. 9½" × 6". Pp. xxxiv + 580. Wien, F. Tempsky; Leipzig, G. Freytag. 1908. K. 19.50.
Vol. LI. Sancti Aureli Augustini opera (Sect. VII. Pars I). Scriptorum contra Donatistas Pars I: Psalmus contra partem donati, contra epistolam Parmeniani libri tres, de Baptismo libri septem, recensuit M. Petschenig. 9½" × 6". Pp. xxiv + 338. Wien, F. Tempsky; Leipzig, G. Freytag. 1908. M. 13.
- Cultrera* (Giuseppe) Saggi sull'Arte Ellenistica e Greco-Romana. I. La Corrente Asiatica. 9½" × 6½". Pp. xlviii + 234. Roma, Ermanno Loescher & Co. 1907. Lire 6.
- Drerup* (Engelbert) [Ἡρώδου] περί Πολιτείας. Ein politisches Pamphlet aus Athen 404 vor Chr. (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, von Dr. E. Drerup, Dr. H. Grimme und Dr. J. P. Kirsch. Band II. Heft 1.) 9½" × 6½". Pp. 124. Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh. 1908. M. 3.20.
- Eirene*. The Official Organ of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Church Union. Published once a quarter. Vol. I. No. 1. 9½" × 6½". Pp. 48. Leighton Buzzard, Faith Press. 1908. 1s.
(In English and Greek.)
- Erasmus*. Altera Colloquia Latina. Adapted from Erasmus, with notes and vocabulary, by G. M. Edwards. (*Pitt Press Series*.) 6½" × 4½". Pp. xxiv + 136. Cambridge, University Press. 1908. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Ford* (H. G.) A School Latin Grammar. (*Methuen's Junior School Books*.) 7½" × 4½". Pp. viii + 248. London, Methuen & Co. 1908. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Γάρδικα (Γεωργίου Κ.) Κρίσις της υπό Σπ. Μωραΐτου ἡ Πλατωνικῆς Εὐδοσεως. 9½" × 6½". Pp. 72. Εν Αθηναις, Τυποῖς Η. Δ. Σακελλαρίου. 1908.
- Gilbert* (Otto) Die Meteorologischen Theorien des griechischen Altertums. Von der königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften mit dem Zogaphospreise gekrönt. 9½" × 6½". Pp. vi + 746, mit 12 Figuren im Text. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. Geh. M. 20; geb. M. 22.50.
- Grossi* (Eliseo) Aquinum. Ricerche di Topografia e di Storia. (*Biblioteca di Geografia Storica*, pubblicata sotto la Direzione di Giulio Beloch. Vol. III.) 10" × 6½". Pp. 210, con due tavole e sette incisioni. Roma, Ermanno Loescher & Co. 1907. Lire 8.
- Henderson* (Bernard W.) Civil War and Rebellion in the Roman Empire A.D. 69-70. A companion to the 'Histories' of Tacitus. 9½" × 5½". Pp. xiv + 360. With maps and illustrations. London, Macmillan & Co. 1908. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Herodotus*. The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books, with introduction, text, apparatus, commentary, appendices, indices, maps by Reginald Walter Macan. 3 vols. 9½" × 5½". Vol. I. Part I. Introduction, Book VII (Text and Commentaries). Pp. c + 356. Vol. I. Part 2. Books VIII and IX (Text and Commentaries). Pp. 357-832. Vol. II. Appendices, Indices, Maps. London, Macmillan & Co. 1908. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Krause* (Dr. Ernst) Diogenes von Apollonia. Teil. I. (*Beilage zu dem Jahresberichte des königlichen Gymnasiums zu Gnesen, Ostern 1908.*) 10½" × 8". Pp. 16. Posen, Merzbachsche Buchdruckerei. 1908.
- Lethaby* (W. R.) Greek Buildings represented by fragments in the British Museum. II. The Tomb of Mausolus. 10" × 6½". Pp. 37-70. London, B. T. Batsford. 1908. 2s. net.
- Manilius* (T. Breiter) Astronomica Herausgegeben von T. B. II. Kommentar. 9½" × 6½". Pp. xvii + 196. Two plans. Leipzig, Weicher. 1908. Mk. 4.20.
- Mosso* (Angelo) The Palaces of Crete and their builders. 10" × 6½". Pp. 348, with 2 plates and 160 figs. London, T. Fisher Unwin. 1907. Cloth, 17s. 6d. net.
- Mueller* (Johannes) und Smend (Rudolf) Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik des Buches Tobit, von Johannes Mueller. Alter und Herkunft des Achikar-Romans und sein Verhältnis zu Aesop, von Rudolf Smend. (*Beihfte zu Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XIII.) 9½" × 5½". Pp. 125. Giessen, A. Töpelmann. 1908. M. 4.40.
- Napoletoni* (Giovanni) Fermo nel Piceno. (*Studi di Storia Antica*, pubblicata da Giulio Beloch. Fasc. VII.) 10" × 7". Pp. viii + 192, con una pianta e tre tavole. Roma, Ermanno Loescher & Co. 1907. Lire 8.
- Pirrone* (Nicola) Fraseologia Ciceroniana ad uso delle scuole classiche. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 216. Milan, Palermo, Naples, Remo Sandron. 1908. Lire 2.50.
- Tacitus*. Tacitus Dialogus Agricola and Germania, translated with introduction and notes by W. Hamilton Fyfe. 7½" × 4½". Pp. viii + 144. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1908. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

ERRATUM.

P. 63, col. 2, line 3, read *sweet* for *sweet*.